¶ An Answere to certein Assertions of M. Fecknam, somtime Abbot of Westminster *which he made of late* against a godly Sermon *of M. Iohn Goughei, preached* in the Tower the xv. of Ianuarie. 1570.

Seen and allowed.

Imprinted at London, by Henrie Bynneman.

CVM PRIVILEGIO.

43
4 6
812

To the right worshipfuls, Sir Frauncis Iobson Knight, Lieuetenaunt of the Toure, Sir Henrie Neuell *Knight, and M. Pellam Lieuetenaunt of the Ordinaunce, geue these.*

*Your worships re-*quest was vpon Sunday last, as I came from the Churche, to know my lyking of M. Goughes Sermon. Wherunto I answered: that I was very lothe to finde any faulte with the sayings or dowings of any man, being already in trouble as you knowe. You replied and sayd: that I was not able to find fault, where no fault was. I had thē no leisure to make any further answer, you departing homewardes, and I to my prison. But now considering wyth my self, ỹ I might seeme vnto you a greater offēder in holding my peace, than in speaking my mind: when as saying nothing I might ingender an opinion in you, that I am obstinate, self willed, and h we no-

thing to mislike but mine owne proper fansie. On the other side, to declare my minde, I might signifie vnto you the iust causes, and true occasions, which I haue to finde fault withall: not so much for reprehending other men, as to shew the necessary stayes of mine owne conscience: I thought good, vppon your lycence graunted and obteyned, to expresse by wryting some faultie matter of his sermon, wherby your worships might perceiue in the rest, how much fault he is worthy of for speaking, and how litle I deserue for not lyking of so vngodly pointes of doctrine. Desiring you most humbly, fauorably to interprete these my notes of reprehending his Sermon: that is, to proceede of a minde, not desirous of contention, but desirous of the truthe: more seeking to satisfie your request and demaund, than to minister any occasion of further argument.

1 That

1 *That it is not impoſsible to keepe Gods commaundements.*

M. Fecknam.

MAſter Gough in his ſermon among other things ſaid: that gods precepts and commaundements giuen to man, be ſo burdenous & heauie, as not poſsible of man to be obſerued. So taught long before him the *Maniches* and the *Valentinians*, denying free will which is the originall of that herſie.

M. Goughe.

For the proofe of his doctrine he brought a familiar example: likening almightie God and vs, to a father and his litle ſonne: who being commaunded of his father to go and fetch a great lumpe of leade, farre aboue his power, weighing a hundred or two hundred weight, & not able to bring it, yet making a profer: the father accepteth his good will, and ſo alloweth the thing to be done, which otherwiſe was and is impoſsible.

Matth. 11. Contrarie to this doctrine is our sauior Christe, where he willeth vs to take his yoke vpō vs, because it is light: *Tollite iugū meū super vos, iugū enim meum suaue est, & onus meū leue.* Take my yoke vpō you, for my yoke is swæt, & my burden light. If it be a light burden, M. Goughs heauy exāple hath not a peny worth of good skil.

1. Iohn. 5. S. John to this effect sayth: *quod mādata eius grauia non sunt:* ỳ his cōmādements be not heauie. If they be not heauie, they be farre vnlike M. Goughs lumpe of lead impossible to bæ taken vp and remoued.

Rom. 2. S. Paul in rebuking these idle herers of ỳ law, which say, they can hear it, but not do it, & fulfil it: writeth. *Nō audit ores legis iusti sūt apud deū, sed factores legis iustificabūtur.* For not ỳ hearers of ỳ law, be iust wō god, but ỳ doers shalbe iustified. If thei do ỳ law, then it may be don, thē it is possible. *Sub esse ad poss.* is a good argument.

They do the workes of the law, therfore they may bæ done.

Luk. 1. The Euāgelist S. Luke of these doers of the law bringeth a full example, writing thus of Zacharie and Elizabeth.

Erant ambo iusti ante Deū, incedentes in omnibus

omnibus mãdatis et iustificationib⁹ dñi sine querela: ỹ is. They were both iuſt before god, walking in al ỹ cõmandements & iuſtificatiõs of ỹ lord, without blame. If S. Luke had ỹ ſpirite of truthe, when he ſaid ỹ theſe two walked in al ỹ cõmãdemẽts: thẽ M. Gough by his denial & impoſſibilitie put therof, muſt nede haue theſpirite of errour & lying. S. John ſayth. *Qui dicit ſe noſſe deũ, et mãdata eius nõ cuſtodit, mendax eſt.* He ỹ ſayth he knoweth God & keepeth not his commaundements, is a lier. 1. Iohn. 2.

S. Ierome writing of theſe teachers, whiche ſay that it is impoſſible to keepe the law, hath theſe words. *Execramur eorũ blaſphemiã q̃ dicũt, impoſsibile aliquid hominem a deo p̃ceptũ eſſe: & mãdata eius nõ a ſingulis ſed ab omnib⁹ in cõmuni poſſe ſeruari,* ỹ is. We deteſt their blaſpheny, which ſay, ỹ god hath cõmanded man to do any thing impoſſible: and ỹ the cõmaundements of god may be kept, not of euery one in particular, but of all in generall. He witneſſeth, ỹ gods cõmandements may be obſerued, of euery one in particular: and ỹ god cõmãdeth nothing impoſſible: for he deteſteth ỹ cõtrary doctrin, & calleth it blaſphemy, & therfore I haue litle cauſe to like it. To. 4. Ieronymus in expoſit. Symbo. ad Damas. Et in dialog. Contra Pelag. lib. 1. &. 3. Tom. 2.

Tom. 10. Augustinus Sermon. 61. de tempore.

S. Austen likewise to the same ende sayeth: *Deus neq; impossibile aliquid potuit imperare quia iustus est: nec damnaturus est hominem, pro eo quod non potuit vitare, quia pius est:* that is. God neither could commaund any thing ẏ is impossible, bicause he is not iust: neither wil he condemne any mã, for that which he could not auoid, bicause he is merciful.

The contrary whereof to maintaine, doth blasphemously argue God, both of iniustice and impietie: when he cõmaundeth vs to do that which M. Gough sayth is impossible: and condemneth vs for that which he saith we could not auoid.

2 *That the holy Angels and Saincts of heauen may heare our prayers.*

MAster Gough went forward, & toke occasion to impugne al prayer, inuocation, & intercession made vnto Saincts, calling it a diuelish Doctrine. So did long before him Vigilantius the hereticke, ageinst whome doth write S. Ierom.

M. Gough.

M.Goughe.

To mainteyne his erroꝛ, he made this pꝛopoſition: that beſide God no Angell, no Spirit, no Saint in heauen, doth knowe what is done here vppon the earthe, touching our internall or externall petitions. And then ſayth hee what a madneſſe is it to pray vnto thoſe, which cānot heare vs?

M.Fecknam.

To this opinion is cleane repugnant the ſaying of our Sauiour Chꝛyſt, when he teacheth that moꝛe ioy ſhal bē in heauen beſoꝛe the Angels of God, vppon one ſinner doing penance, than vpon ninetie and nine iuſt mē, which nēd no penaūce. But Angels can haue no ioye of ẏ thing which they do not knowe: neither if they do knowe our penaunce, ſhall they be ignoꝛant of our petitions. Theꝛefoꝛe wē be not mad in pꝛaying vnto them, but they be moꝛe than mad whiche make thē ſo ignoꝛant, as if they in heauen knewe no moꝛe what is done in earth: than we in earth knowe what is done in heauen.

This alſo is refelled by the ſaying of the Angel Raphael vnto Tobie: *Quando orabas cum lachrimis, & ſepeliebas mor-*

Tob. 12. *tuos, & derelinquebas prandium tuum, & mortuos abscondebas per diem in domo tua, & nocte sepelisbas eos, ego obtuli orationem tuam domino.* that is: Whē thou prayedst with teares, and buriedst the dead, and forsakest thy dynner, and hiddest by the daye dead folkes in thy house, and buriedst thē in the night, I did offer thy prayer vnto the Lorde. All these things the Angell Raphaell did know, when Tobie thought least thereof. And what? shal we aduenture to saye, that the same Angell knewe it onely? And affirme that no other Angel doth know the like? for shall ỳ Angels know it & not ỳ glorified saintes of God, when he promiseth of thē that in the resurrection they shalbe like Angels? Mat. 22.

Here we may sée, ỳ God doth not kepe ỳ secrets of mē (through distāce of place) onely vnto himselfe, as M. Goughe teacheth, but doth also reuele them vnto his creaturs how far & how much it pleaseth him. As we read of ỳ prophet Eliseus in ỳ 4. booke of the kings, which knew al ỳ secrets of ỳ king of *Syria*, done in his priuie chāber, & disclosed thē to ỳ king of *Israel*. For ỳ king of *Syria* misdouting lest some 4. Reg. 6.

one

one about him had bewrayed his secrets, a seruāt of his made answer: *Nequaquā domine mi rex. sed & Eliseus qui propheta est in Israel indicat regi Israel omnia verba quæ loquutus fueris in cōclaui tuo:* that is, not so my lādge king, but Eliseus the Prophete which is in *Israel* doth tel ỳ king of *Israell* euery word which thou hast spokē in thy secret chamber. S. Luke also doth make mentiō in ỳ Actes, how Peter knew ỳ secret thoughts of Ananias going about to deceyue him in ỳ prise of ỳ fæld which he had sold, saying vnto him: *Anania, quare posuisti in corde tuo hāc rē?* Ananias why hast thou put this thing in thy hart? that is, why hast thou thought with thy selfe, thus to deceyue almightie god? Other examples I could bring, but I leaue them for breuities sake, making this a plaine consequent ỳ if god wold reuele vnto his seruaunts here vpon earth, such secret intelligence without any derogatiō of his diuine power & knowledge, much more will he reuele vnto his saints in heauen, far more ample intelligēce, both of celestial & terrestrial things without any derogatiō of his diuine power & knowlege. Act. 5.

The

Tom. 5. Au. de Ciuitate Dei. lib. 20. Cap. 22.

The like Argumente S. Austen was wont to make, saying: *Si Prophetæ, nondum facta nosse potuerant, per hoc quod erat Deus (quantulumcunq; erat) in eorum mortalium mentibus: quomodo immortales sancti, iam facta tunc nescient cùm erit 'Deus omnia in omnibus':* that is: If the Prophetes could knowe things before they were done, by this that God was, (howe much soeuer he was) in the minds of thē as yet being mortall: how shall they not know then, things that be done alreadie, being immortall Saints, when GOD shalbee in them all in all?

M. Goughe.

M. Goughe to proue that no Sainct being dead cā heare vs, alleadged the saying of ỳ Prophet Isai, where he speaketh in the person of the people on this wyse: *Tu enim pater noster, Abraham nescivit nos, & Israel ignorauit nos:* Thou O God art our Father, Abraham hath not known vs, and Israell hath bin ignorant of vs. That is (sayth M. Goughe) now after thei be dead, they haue no manner of knowledge of vs, but be clean ignorāt of things done here vppon the earth.

Esai. 63.

M. Feckham

M. Fecknam.

But S. Ierome hath an other interpretation, which I think I may preferre before M. Goughes saying: *Abraham nescivit nos, id est, Abraham non agnouit nos pro filijs.* Abraham hath not knowen vs, that is, Abraham hath not alowed, or acknowledged vs for his children. And why? *quia te offendimus*, bycause we haue offended thē, sayth S. Ierom, he sayth not, *quia Abraham & Israel mortui sunt*: bycause Abraham and Israell be dead: as if therby they could haue no lōger knowledge of them. To this sense of Isaies wordes, oure Sauiour Christe sayth in Matthew to those that vaunted themselues that they had caste out Diuels in his name and done miracles in his name, *Nunquam noui vos*, I neuer knewe you. Likewyse to the foolish Virgines, *Non noui vos*, I knowe you not. Not that any ignorance should be in Christe, or lack of knowledge: but he meaneth, that he neuer knew them for his, he neuer accepted them, he neuer approued them. A cōmon phrase of speache, when the Father will say vnto the leude sonne: out of my sight Mat. 7. Mat. 25.

I knowe thée not: that is I take thée not for myne.

Tom. 4. De cura agenda pro mortuis. Cap. 16.

If this will not satisfye M. Goughe, let him heare Sainct Austen, who sheweth vppon occasion of this place, in what manner the Saincles do heare vs: *Per diuinam, inquit, potentiam, Martyres viuorum rebus interſunt: quoniã defuncti, per naturam propriam, viuorum rebus intereſſe non poſſunt:* that is: By diuine power, the Martyres are here present, in the doings of those that bée a liue: For being dead, by their owne proper nature, to bée present in the doings of those that bée a liue, they can not.

Tom 9. Aug. super Ioan. Tract. 84

To this doctrine he is constant in many places, but I will recite onely two, the one in his Tractes vpon John, where hée speaketh of holy Martyres and those that dyed for the name of Chryste: *Ideo quippe ad ipſam menſam, non ſic eos commemoramus, quemadmodum alios qui in pace requieſcunt: vt etiam pro eis oremus, ſed magis vt orent ipſi pro nobis:* that is, Therefore at the table (meaning at the Altare) we do not so remember the martyres, as we do remember other that do rest

reſt in peace: that wée ſhould prayе likewiſe for them, but rather that they ſhold prayе for vs. A double teſtimonie to confirme both the inuocation of Saints, and praying for the dead.

The other place is in his booke *De Baptiſmo contrà Donatiſt*: Where he inuocateth the helpe of S. Cyprian beyng dead, ſaying: *Beatus Cyprianus adiuuet nos orationibus ſuis, vt donante Domino, quantum poſſumus bona eius imitemur*: that is, Holy Cyprian, let him helpe vs with his prayers, that oure Lorde graunting, wée may follow his good workes as much as wée may. Tom. 7. Aug. de bap. cont. Donat. lib. 7. Cap. 14.

To this doctrine commeth Gregorie Nazianzene, Saincte Ieromes Maiſter, where he inuocateth the helpe of Saincte Baſil ſaying: *Tu ô Baſili, ex alto nos reſpice: Et carnis ſtimulum aut tuis ſiſte precibus, aut fortiter nos ferre, ora.* Thou O Baſill, looke vppon vs from heauen aboue: And with thy prayers, eyther ceaſe this pricke of the fleaſhe: Or elſe praye, that wée maye ſtrongly beare it and ouercome it. Gregor. Nazian. in Monod. Baſilij.

Now

Orig. lib. in B. Iob. in fin. lib. Ephr. in Ser. de laudibus Marty. Ieron. in Epith. Paulæ. Chrisost. Homil. 66. ad popul. Anti. Tom 5.

Now, if M. Goughe will terme these graue Fathers, and so holy men: like as other moe, Origen calling vpon Iob, S. Ephrem calling vpon the martyrs, S. Ierome calling vppon the famouse woman Paula, and S. Chrisostome commending the Emperour for frequenting the Martyrs tombes, and praying vnto them: If he will call them all mad men, fowlishe men, popish and superstitious Idolaters: In Gods name, let him do so: I had leuer haue a dragm of their superstition, than a great lump of leade of M. Goughes integritie.

3 *That onely fayth dooth not iustifie.*

Tom 6. Au. de Hæres. Hæres. 54.

MAister Goughe likewyse in fewe wordes would vehemently haue persuaded, like as other heretofore him, that sole fayth, or onely fayth doth iustifie vs. So did long agoe teache Eunomius of that fayth whiche he professed, as S. Austen reciteth in his 6. Tome de Heresi.

M. Goughe

M. Goughe.

To confirme his opinio out of the scripture, he brought the saying of the apostle: *Arbitramur iustificari per fidem hominem, sine operibus legis.* We thinke or determine that a man is iustified by fayth without the works of the law: concluding by this testimonie of S. Paule, that works do in no maner of wise iustifie vs: not only those which goe before faith, but also those whiche doo follow faith. For touching any iustification by works, he maketh the like condition of them both. Rom. 3.

M. Fecknam.

First, I maruell that Maister Goughe will allowe this terme onely, when it is not expressed in Canonicall Scripture. Nert I am sure, that there is nothing equiualent vnto it: for fayth without the workes of the Lawe and fayth onely, or fayth simplie without workes, be not of one like condition. Saint Paule excluding workes of the law, meaneth workes that goe before fayth, whiche do not iustifye. So Iames in the Example of Abraham, forbidding that fayth onely should

iustifye, speaketh of woꝛkes that followe faith, which do also iustifye: that is, giue encrease of iustice: *Abraham pater noster, nonne ex operibus iustificatus est, offerens Isaac filium suum super altare?* Abraham our father, was he not iustifyed by woꝛks, when he offered his sonne Isaac vppon the altar? To this effect S. Austen reconcileth these two Apostles, saying: *Non sunt contrariæ duorum Apostolorum sententiæ, Pauli et Iacobi, cùm dicit vnus iustificari hominem per fidem sine operibus: & alius dicit, inanem esse fidem sine operibus: quia ille dicit de operibus quæ præcedunt fidem: iste de his, quæ sequuntur fidem:* that is: These sentences of the two Apostles, Paule and James, be not contrarie vnto them selues: when the one sayeth, that a man is iustifyed by fayth without woꝛkes: the other sayeth that faith is vayne & idle, without woꝛkes: foꝛ Paule speaketh of woꝛkes that goe before faith: James speaketh of those that followe faith.

Iac. 2.

Tom. 4. August. in lib. 83. quęstion. quęs. 76.

M. Goughe.

An other place he brought, to expresse by Scripture this woꝛde onely: That fayth onely

onely doth iuſtifye: alledging the ſaying of Chryſt vnto Iairus prince of the ſynagoge: *Crede tantū*, beleeue only. A place very fitlie applied: as if Chriſte there had ſpoken, of the iuſtification of Iairus, and not rather of the corporall reuiuing of his dead daughter. Luc. 18.

M. Fecknam.

Firſt, S. Iames vnto this meaning of M. Goughe, that faith only ſhould iuſtifie, (whereby he meaneth to exclude al maner of iuſtification by workes done in faith) hath a place that is cleane contradictorie, ſaying thus after the example brought of Abraham: *Videtis quoniam ex operibus iuſtificatur homo, & non ex fide tantum.* You ſee, that a man is iuſtified by workes, and not by faith onely. By faith onely to be iuſtified, and not by faith only to be iuſtified, be contradictorie. Iac. 2.

This place therfore of S. Luke is violently handled of M. Goughe: & rather by force wreſted to his owne peculiar ſtuffe, than naturally applyed to the meaning of Chriſt. For there is no relation made to ỹ faith of Iairus touching iuſtification, as if Chryſte had willed him onely to beleeue, Luc. 8

and then he should be iustified: but to the weakenesse of that faith of his which began to faint, and mistrust the power of Christ in reuiuyng his daughter, after that a messenger came from home, and told him, that his daughter was dead. This sayth Christ erected & confirmed by these wordes, Beleeue onely: as if he had said, feare not, misdout not, but put thy only trust in mée as thou hast begon, and thy daughter neuertheleſſe shalbe restored both to life and to health agein. This is the finall ende of those wordes, beleeue only, *Crede tantum*: which tooke their effect, not in spiritual iustification of Iairus the father, but in ẏ corporall reuiuing of his daughter, for any thing ẏ is there in the scripture expressed.

Tom. 4. Aug. de fide & operibus. Cap. 14.

S. Austen in his booke *de fide & operibus*, shewed the beginning & foūdation of this much like hereſie, to haue bin in ẏ Apostles times vpon the misconstruing of Paules Epistles, saying: *Quoniam hæc opinio tum fuerat exorta, aliæ Apostolicæ epistolæ, Petri, Ioānis, Iacobi, & Iudæ cōtra eā maximè dirigunt intentionē: vt vehementer astruant, fidem ſine operibus nihil prodeſſe:* that is: By cause this opiniō was thē sprong vp, other

Apo-

Apostolical epistles of Peter, John, James and Jude do bende their drift and purpose most of all against that opinion that they may boldly and vehemently affirme, faith without workes to auayle nothing. If it be faith only, it is faith without workes: if faith only auayleth nothing, faith only can not iustifie.

Likewise he saith in his booke *de Trini.* very brefly, but pithily. *Sine charitate fides quidem potest esse, sed non est prodesse*, that is: without charitie faith may bee, but without charitie it can nothing auayle vs. Tom. 3. August. de Tri. lib. 15. Cap. 18.

Of workes that be done in faith.

IT is then a preposterous waye, & a blasphemous doctrine to extol ỹ excellẽcie of faith, by reuyling & extenuating ỹ worthie fruts therof: calling thẽ abominable, vile, and stinking in the face of God, as if there were no difference betwene workes done of infidels & Idolaters, of which Isai speaketh, whẽ he likeneth thẽ to a filthie cloth: & betwene workes done of christians, and true beleuers, of which our sauior Christ speaketh in S. Mat. shewing how they shal be acceptable in Gods sighte, and rewar- Esay. 64. Math. 6.

ded with lyfe euerlasting. For there he maketh a distinct conference, and separation, betweene the praying, fasting and gyuing almes of the Scribes and Pharises, which do it onely for vaine glories sake: & therefore they haue onely that vayne reward: and betweene the praying, fasting, and giuing almes of those whiche bee true members of Christe, which do it onely for Gods sake, and therefore they shall haue a reward of him, of lyfe euerlasting. If these workes had bin so vile, and so filthie in the sight of God, as M. Gough doth filthily terme thē, Christ would neuer haue made for them such a glorious promis: nor prouided for them such a crowne of glorie: nor reserued for them, his finall iudgement: in the which iudgemēt, not the fayth, but the workes of men shalbe examined. But M. Goughe doth cōtemptuously abuse ỳ gifts of god, ỳ works ỳ himself hath wrought in his chosen elect: & doth miserably cōfound ỳ good works of idolaters, wᵗʰ the good works of thē that be his faithful and elect people: which works he so much estæmeth, being done in faith & for his sake, as not to suffer a cup of cold water to go vnrewarded.

Mat. 25.

Mat. 10.

I

I muſe therefore at the ſutteltie of this opiniõ, or rather at the ſenſible abſurditie of it: faith only, or ſole faith to iuſtifie. For if he meane by faith onely, faith without penance, faith without baptiſme, then his doctrine is ageinſt ẏ coũſell of Peter, who anſwered the Iewes, aſking of ẏ Apoſtles what they ſhold do to be ſaued, ſaying: *Pœnitentiã agite, et baptizetur vnuſquiſq; veſtrũ in nomine Ieſu Chriſti in remiſſionẽ peccatorum veſtrorũ.* Do ye penance, and let euery one of you be baptized in the name of Ieſu Chriſt, that your ſins may be remitted. Act. 2. If he mean by faith only, faith without hope, then he is ageinſt the Apoſtle ſaying: *Spe enim ſalui facti ſumus.* For by hope we are ſaued. Rom. 8. If he mean by faith only, faith without feare, then is he ageinſt the ſaying of Ieſus the ſonne of Sirach: *Timor Domini expellit peccatũ, nã qui ſine timore eſt, non poterit iuſtificari.* Ecclc. 1. The feare of God expelleth ſinnes, for he that is without feare can not be iuſtified: if he meane by faith onely, faith withoute charitie, he is then contrarie to the minde of S. Paule him ſelfe: Gal. 5. which ſheweth, what kynd of fayth doth iuſtifie, *fides quæ per dilectionem operatur,*

that faythe whiche worketh by charitie, that is not sole nor onely faythe. Wherfore yf Master Coughe will buyld vppon this terme sole or onely, and yet neuertheleſſe, meane by his sole and only fayth, fayth with penance, faith with Baptisme, fayth with feare, fayth with hope, fayth with loue and charitie: then I say, that the same fayth can no more be sayd to be onely or alone: than a King or Prince beyng in the middeſt of his Nobilitie, may bee sayd to be there onely or alone.

4 *That euery sinne is not mortall.*

MAster Coughe towards the end of his sermon, did very constantly affirme, that euery sinne committed by a Christian man, is a deadly and a mortall sin: and that no sinne is veniall, no not an ydle thought, as light as men made of it, much like vnto the old hereſie of Iouinian, which to make all sinnes equall, made euery sinne likewise a deadly sinne, whome S. Auſten condemned more than a thousand yeare ago, as appeareth in his 6. Tome. *de hæreſ.* Hæreſ. 82.

M. Feck-

M. Fecknam.

Let vs confer herewithall two sayings of the scripture: the one of S. John, which sayth as well of himselfe and of euery iust man, as of a sinner. *Si dixerimus, quoniam peccatum nō habemus, ipsos nos seducimus, & veritas in nobis non est.* If we say that we haue no sinne, we deceiue our selues, and the truthe is not in vs. Meaning, that the iustest man a liue, is not withoute sinne: Now if this sinne be as M. Goughe teacheth, deadly, mortal and damnable sinne, which separateth the soule of man from God, and condemneth it to hell fire: let vs see how a man may be called iust, which daily committeth such damnable sinne.

Nay, let vs repeat againe that commendation of iustice, which S. Luke giueth to Zacharie and Elizabeth, saying: *Erant autem iusti ambo ante Deum, incedentes in omnibus mandatis et iustificationibus Domini sine quærela.* That is: they were both iust before God, walking in all the commaundements and iustifications of our Lorde, without blame. He giueth three speciall notes of their true and perfecte righteousnesse: the one, that they were iust, not in Luke. 1.

the sight of men, but before God him selfe: the second that they kept all the commandements, which M. Gough saith is impossible to kæp: the third that they were without blame, and therfore without mortal & damnable sinne. If M. Gough neuertheless will say, that S. John speaking of him selfe, and of iust men, ment by sinne, a damnable sinne: he must then of very force make bet wæne him & S. Luke the Euangelist a manifest contradiction: for no mã that sinneth damnably, is without blame, kæpeth the commaundements, and is iust in the sight of God.

To this may be added the saying of S. James where he describeth concupiscence to make a sinne in vs besides mortall sin: saying: *Cõcupiscentia cũ conceperit, parit peccatum, peccatũ verò cùm consummatũ fuerit, generat mortẽ*: that is: Cõcupiscence when it hath conceiued, bringeth forth sinne: but sinne when it is finished, begetteth death: signifying hereby: that sinne is then mortall and deadly, when a man committeth it with full consent & other circumstances. For if a light passion or carnall thought stealeth vpon a man by sodeu delectation, with-

Iac. 1.

without consent, the same is not a sinne which engendereth death, but a venial sin.

To this place alludeth S. Austen where he speaketh of concupiscence that remayneth in those which be regenerate, saying: *Ab illo rebellante, & si non letaliter, sed venialiter tamen vincimur.* That is. Of that sinne concupiscence rebelling against vs, we be ouercommed, although not deadly, yet for al ỹ venially. It foloweth: *Et in his contrahimus, vnde quotidie dicamus dimitte nobis debita nostra.* And in these (veniall sins) we gather, by means wherof we may say daily, forgiue vs Lord our trespasses.

Tom. 7. Aug. lib. 2. cont. Iulian. pa. 985. col. 1. littera D.

This place is of original sin, and not cõcupiscẽce, and clipped bothe in the hed and tail.

Again in his boke *de spirit. & lit.* he writeth thus of venial sinnes: *Sicut non impediunt à vita æterna iustum quædam peccata venialia, sine quibus hæc vita non ducitur: sic ad salutẽ eternam nihil prosunt impio aliqua bona opera, sine quib⁹ difficillimè vita cuiusq; pessimi hominis inuenitur:* that is. Like as some veniall sins do not let a iust man frõ life euerlasting, without the which this life is not lead: so some good workes do nothing profit a wicked man vnto life euerlasting, without the which ỹ life of euery naughtie man is hardly found.

Tom. 3. Aug. de spir. & lit. cap. 28

Luther in assertion. suis. I might bring here for venial sinne, one of Martine Luthers Assertions, whom I am sure M. Goughe will rather worship than deny, for the pure loues sake which he beareth to his religion: but I will not presse him so far: only this I wil say, that Luther did hold there was a sinne which was not a mortall and damnable sinne: For he maketh euery good worke of a Christen man to be a sinne, Parie (sayeth he) a sinne that is veniall. His article was, *Quod omne opus bonum, sit peccatū veniale*: that euery good worke is a veniall sinne.

The seueritie therefore of M. Goughes doctrin, is in this point very auster, rather Stoicall than christian like much preiudiciall to the libertie of the Gospel, which otherwise he professeth & magnifieth with great solemnitie. For now he maketh euery light fact, euery idle word, euery vaine thought a heinous & capital crime, a mortall and damnable sinne, a trespasse deseruing euerlasting pain & perpetual torment.

Prouerb. 24 He maketh euery mā at least. vij. times euery day, to offend God damnably: For Salomon writeth of the iust man, *septies in die cadit iustus*, the iust man doth fal. vij times

times a day: to deskant no further of the numbre. That is by M. Coughes iudgement, a iust man euery day .vij. times doth sinne mortally, damnably, he is .vij. times a day the sõne of perdition, vij. times a day the bondslaue of Sathan: notwithstanding he is iust righteous: which is an absurde contradiction, & a Doctrine fondly grounded vppon mere possibilities. If this be the state of iust men, and righteous men, mercifull God helpe vs, that be suche pore and miserable sinners.

Vppon this opinion must nedes folow, that wicked Caine and iust Abel: the elect Isaac and the reprobate Ismael: the welbeloued Iacob, & the hated Esau: Iohn the rebuker of sinne, and the viperous generation of the Pharisies: Simon Peter the true cõfessor of Christ, and Simon Magus the malitious denyer: Iohn the blessed Euangelist, and Iudas the cursed traytor: were for the tyme of this present life (being all here vppon earth sinners, and therfore by M. Coughes position, all daily in mortal and damnable sinne) al in like miserable case, all in like state of perdition: hauing their soules by mortal sinne, euery

day

day.vij.times at the lest in most wretched wise deuided from God, & seperated from him, the only life therof. As if they had bin al very infidels, & no more appertaining to the sinceritie of faith, and the frutes therof, than the Paynimes & the Heathen people. Of whome we can say no more, than that euery sinne they do is a mortall and a damnable sinne.

But this is the new found way of persuasion to exhort a sinner to repentance, & to preache that he can not chuse but euery day sin damnably: to exhort a man to good works, & to preach that they be all filthy & abhominable in the sight of god: to exhort a man to charitie, & to preach ý only faith, or sole faith doth iustifie: to exhort one mā to pray for an other here in earth, & to forbid ý one man shall desire an other to pray for him in heauen: to exhort euery mā to kēp Gods commandements, & to say ý it is impossible for any man to kēp them. Would God M. Gough, I wish it with my whole hart, had both ý grace to preache, & the gift to vnderstād more sounder doctrine, more to the glory of god, more to ý edefying of mē, and then more, not to my liking only, but

other

other mennes tw: in the mean time, I can not only nothing like it, but also must find fault with it, in so much as your worships do require and demaund my lyking.

I cõclude therfore, hauing not in ample wise, but cõpendiously, touching these.iiij. points of controuerũe truely and sincerely declared vnto your worships ỹ iust causes which I haue to mislike with M. Goughes sermon: which I could not do at the same time, when you first demaũded of me: neither now wold take vpon me, but if ye had assured me of frẽ leaue of licence. I refer the rest of my minde, in confuting the rest of his Sermon, to the discrete wisdome of your worships al, charitably to be cõsidered. Desiring this, and requesting, that before the contradiction & absurditie of these propositions, may better agrẽ together, M. Gough to say that the cõmandements of God be ouer heauy and impossible to be obserued: S. John to say, that they be not heauie: And Christe to say that they be swẽte and light: And S. Luke to say that Zacharie and Elizabeth kept all the commaundementes. Maister Goughe to say, ỹ fayth alone, or onely fayth doth iustifie.

1. Iohn. 5.
Math. 11.
Luke. 1.

S. Paule

Gala 5. Iacob. 2. S. Paul to say, that faith working by charitie doth iustifie: and S. Iames to say that workes also do iustifie, and not faith only. M. Gough to say, that no saint nor Angell in heauen can heare our prayers: the Angel Raphaell to say that he offered vp the Tob. 12. prayers of Tobie: and our sauior Christ Luk. 15. to say that the Angels do reioyce vpon euery sinners repentance, (which can not reioyce vnles they know wherfore.) Master Gough to say, that euery sinne is mortall, and that we be euery day deadly sinners in Iac. 1. the sight of God. S. Iames to say, ý there is a sinne, before it be mortall and damnable sinne: And S. Luke to say that Zacharie & Elizabeth were iust euen in the sight Luke. 1. of God: Beside the testimonies of auncient fathers, which do constantly, and vniformly stand on my side: He hauing for his opinions the reliques of old condemned, and now reuiued heresies of the *Maniches*, Eunomius, Vgilantius & Iouinian, ageinst whom the said Fathers did many hundred yeares a goe write, as their Monuments can amplie testifie.

I desire, I say, to make my humble sute vnto your worshippes for my selfe and my

my prison followes both, that hereafter we may not be haled by the armes to the church in such violent manner ageinst our willes, ageinst al former example, ageinst the doctrine of your own syde (Luther, Bucer, Bullinger, Zwinglius, Oecolampadius, Melancthon, and the reste, euery one writing and earnestly persuading, that al violence be taken away in matters of religion) there to heare such Preachers, as care not what they say, so they somewhat say ageynst the professed fayth of Chrystes catholike Church: & there to heare a sermon, not of persuading vs, but of rayling vppon vs. This if your worshippes will encline vnto for charitie sake, wée shall haue to render you most humble thankes, and whatsoeuer els wée may doo, in this our heauie tyme of imprisonment.

(∵)

Here ensueth the answere to these Assertions and Obiections of M. Fecknam. Made by *L.T.*

I. E. Laurence Tomson. for ye Catalogue of popish Books answered by Protestants in Qu. Eliz.s time at ye beginning of Dr Fulk's Retentive.

¶ An Answer to certeine Assertions and Obiections of M. Fecknam sometime Abbot of Westminster,

Which he made of late against a godly Sermon of M. Iohn Goughs, preched in the Toure the. xv. of Ianuarie. 1570.

1 *That it is not impossible to kepe Gods commandements.* Fecknam.

Act. xv. vers. x. and. xj. Now therefore, why tempt ye God, to lay a yoke on the disciples neckes, which neither our fathers, nor we were able to beare? But we belene through the grace of the Lord Iesus Chryst to be saued, euen as they do. S. Peter.

Rom. vij. vers. vij. For (that that was impossible to the law, in as much as it was weake, because of the flesh) God sending his owne sonne, in the similitude of sinfull flesh, and for sinne, condemned sinne in the flesh. S. Paule.

2 *That the holy Angels and Saincts of heauen may heare our prayers.* Fecknam.

Salomon. *Ecclesiastes.ix.verſ.v.and.vj. For the lyuing know that they ſhal die, but the dead know nothing at al, neither haue they any more a rewarde: for their remembrance is forgotten. Alſo their loue and their hatred: and their enuie is nowe periſhed, and they haue no more portion for euer, in all that is done vnder the ſunne.*

Fecknam. 3 *That onely fayth doth not iuſtifie.*

S.Paule. *Rom.iij.verſ.xxviij.and.xxx. Therefore we conclude that a man is iuſtified by faythe without the workes of the law. For it is one God who ſhall iuſtifie circumciſion of faith, and vncircumciſion through faith.*

Fecknam. 4. *That euery ſin is not mortall.*

S.Iohn. *j.Ep.iij.verſ.iiij. Whoſoeuer committeth ſinne, tranſgreſſeth alſo the law: for ſin is the trãſgreßion of the law.*

S.Paule. *Rom.vj.verſ.xxiij. For the wages of ſinne is death · but the gift of God is eternall lyfe through Ieſus Chriſt our Lord.*

To

To the right worshipfull,

Sir Frauncis Iobſon Knight, Liuetenaunt of the Tour, Sir Henry Neuel knight, and M. Pellam Lieuetenaunt of the Ordinaunce.

THere was deliuered vnto me vpon the .4. of March. 1570. by a frend of mine, a little pamflet written by M. Fecknam ſomtime Abbot of Weſtminſter, which he exhibited vnto your worſhippes, vppon demaund by you made of his liking of a godly Sermon preached by M. Goughe in the Toure the .15. of Januarie. 1570. Which when I had red ouer, I maruayled not a little bothe at the weakeneſſe of hys cauilling Obiections, he vſeth againſt ſuche godly poincts of Doctrine, as he laboreth, by forſing of Scriptures and Doctors to his purpoſe, to ouerthrow: and alſo at his boldneſſe in offering the ſame vnto you. For I thought vntill I had peruſed it, that in ſo little a treatiſe, ſo great ignorance of Scriptures, of Doctors, of the common

Arte of Logicke, which boyes after one or two yeares being in the vniuersities, are not ignoraunt in, could not haue ben foūd in him, who carieth so great a name and countenaunce of learning: Or at the least if his ignorance had bene such, as by this I vnderstand it in dede to be, that he coulde by politique silence haue concealed it, and not by wryting to your worshippes, (men I doubte not but of perfecte knowledge and sound iudgement in al poynts of true religion) reuealed both it and the weakenesse of their common cause, which so fain he would support. How be it for this latter, in his Preamble he pretendeth some cause, as the auoyding with your worships, the opinion of obstinacie, self wilfulnesse, want of iust matter to mislike in the foresayd Sermon. &c and this in dæde is but a bare pretence. For the bitternesse of his stile, and smothe scoffes, which he vseth too oftē in so short a discourse vpon. iiij. points, sheweth, he rather by these cauils sought to rid his stomake of a litle choler, than any thing else: or to abuse and seduce your worships as men altogether ignorant in these questions. But yet I will thinke the

best,

best, as ỳ rule of charitie teacheth me, and conceiue hope of his conuersion, for which also I pray with my whole harte. And in case he blame me as not iudging rightly of this his writing, being therunto requested by you: let him waigh wel his owne & last words in his preface vnto you, & say plainly whether a simple & plain meaning may be gathered of them: they be these. More seking to satisfie your request and demaūd, than to minister any occasiō of further argument. What meaneth he hereby? Is he rather moued with satisfying your request thā the cause it self he standeth in, which he wold make appeare to the world to be the truth? Or if the truth of his .iiij. assertions did more moue him, than your requestes, why feareth he least by his writing, occasion of further argument touching these questions be ministred?

If he know that he hath here by good argument maintcyned a good cause, then is there no cause why he should feare further debating, but he ought like a good minister and teacher, stand and offer him self ready prepared to the defence thereof, yea though it were with daunger and losse of

his lyfe. But yf he be guiltie in his owne conscience of the naughtinesse of the cause and his owne weake proues, why doth he so much abuse your worships with a shew of confutation of the truth? What iust causes and true occasions haue lead him to reprehend so godly points of doctrine, taught by M. Gough, I referre to the iudgement of any indifferent and learned Reader. I haue vsed as much breuitie as I could, in aunswering his arguments, that the reading therof might not be tediouse to you. And last of all I thought good in mine own behalfe, (lest some might thinke amisse of me for mainteyning the quarrell, made agaynst an other man, as one desirous of contention, vayne glorie &c.) to protestе vnto your worshippes, that the earnest request of my very friend, who knew me to haue a little spare time and M. Gough to be otherwise more profitably occupied, forced me to say somwhat in way of an aunswere to M. Fecknam: that I speake nothing of the truth of the common cause of religiō, which of it selfe ought to moue any man zelous in Gods religion, to take pen in hand agaynst any that shall seeke to impugne

pugn the same. Thus much I thought good to let you vnderstand of the occasion of my dealing herein, and partly also for a peece of an aunswere to such talke, as M. Fecknam in his preface directeth, specially to your worships. The Lord Iesus confirme you in all truth daily encreasing his knowledge and all other good giftes in you,

Amen.

1 *That it is not impossible to keepe Gods commaundements.*

BEfore I come to your proues & allegations, I must say a word or two of your coloured art and godly shew you make in your first proposition. It is the fashion of Rhetoricians (as you know) especially when their cause is not all of the best, & therfore misdoute the euent of their action, so to behaue them selues in their *Exordium*, that they may at the least purchase thus much, ỳ they may be heard, some by one meanes, some by an other, the worst is not by procuring an euill suspicion to his aduerse partie. So is your dealing in this present case, to be better heard peraduenture or to make your cause seeme to bee better, you geue forth that in M. Coughes doctrine of the impossibilitie of keeping Gods commaundementes, he followeth the race of the Maniches and the Valentinians. A grie-

uous

nous accusation yf it were true and wor-
thy to cause his doctrine to bee reiected, yf
all that you speake were a Gospell. But
peraduentare you thought you hadde the
serton of Paules in hand, when you pre-
sented this your writing to the worshipps
of these in deede worshipfull & godly gen-
tlemen. The matter is thus, not many ye-
res since, a good companion minding to re-
create him selfe with the serton, charged
him selfe with a basket heauy laden as
he made the matter appeare, directing his
way through Paules Churche, because it
was the shorter: where he was mette of
his mate: and demaunded why in that so-
lemne time he passed thorough that place
so charged, a thing not to bee endured, the
circumstaunces beyng considered. This
companion desired him to lette him passe,
for that hee was heauye laden with cer-
tayne plate, and therefore the gladder to
take the shorter way. The serton woulde
not bee persuaded, but alleadging the
Quenes profite, caused him to sette
downe his basket, and sente imme-
diatlye for suche as to whome it apper-
tayned to haue the view of such matters:

who

who thinking to haue found some great matter, as they had bin enformed by the sexton, willed the basket to be opened, and what found they? for a cupbourde of plate a basket of hornes. Thus had he his iest at the sexton: but you M. Fecknam, thankes be vnto God, haue not to do with a sexton: they dō well sée your horny plate: but because you your selfe deceyued your selfe, thinking it to be plate, they haue vsed this charitable way, that it may be shewed vnto you, that they are in déede but hornes. And therefore this horne will nothing moue them as I trust, vntill you bée able to shewe that the denying of frée will, to the establishing of the grace of God, wherby wée are iustified from sinne, and saued from infirmitie, is the doctrine of Maniche or Valentinian. This I remember Valentinian and his say, that to vs, *qui ab Eccl:sia sumus, opera necessaria esse, aliter enim impossibile est seruari*, which are of the Churche workes bée necessarie, for otherwise it is impossible to bée saued, and that teach you: *ipsos verò non per opera, sed propterea quòd ex natura spirituales sunt, penitus & omnino saluari docet*, but they teach that they

Aug. Ep. 95

Epiph. con. hæret. lib. j To. 2. cap. 31.

they them selues are wholy & altogither saued, not by worckes, but bycause of nature they bee spirituall: and this teacheth not M. Gough. Therfore that glose might well haue bin lefte out, yf you hadde more thought vpon the truth of the matter, how well you might haue alleaged it, than onely for a cloke of your self barely to alleage it. For to proue M. Gough a Manichean, or any of his fellowes in his heresies, it will bee hard for you, and as impossible as to fulfill the law: but to prowe you a Pelagian, it is easie enough, and as easie as in Christ Iesus for M. Gough and vs to kepe the lawe. But to prowe you suche a one is not my cheef purpose: my mind is rather to conuince your heresie, and bring you to the flocke of Christ, yf it so please God to giue you the eyes of vnderstanding, and a hart to repent. Therfore to dw the dutie of good Christias, let vs yeld our selues vnto God to be gouerned by his spirit. & submit our selues in hũblenes to his word, & without al vayne opinion of wel or euil defending a question, arrest our selues vpon his Prophetes & Apostles, which haue and dw shew vs the way to walke in, and minister

ster vnto vs the true light, whereby we may chase away al these darknesses. This waye if we take, no doubt he will shew vs the truthe: if we reiecte it, why should he not farther punish vs with blindnesse?

So then to come to your first position, That it is not impossible to keepe Gods commaundements, I wil aunswere youre places of the scripture alleadged and your Doctors, and there withall shewe oute of them both the contrarie, that it is impossible, and so shall I shew I trust, that in that article M. Gough hath taught no vngodly point of doctrine, and so will I do consequently with the residue. And that it may be more plainly and euidently done, that there may be no occasion of doubte in any braunche of my doctrine, I wil first shewe howe they are impossible, and by what meanes: and after, howe they are possible, and howe they may be fulfilled. This done, I shall sufficiently aunswere youre places alleadged, and if GOD so will, take awaye this vayle from before youre eyes, which is a let vnto you that you can not see.

Touching the firste, S. Paule dilating and

and amplifying his probation of the free iustification which we haue thorough the tender mercie of GOD in Christ Iesus, sayeth in this wyse: τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου. &c. For that that was impossible to the Lawe in as much as it was weake bicause of the flesh, God sending his sonne in the similitude of sinfull flesh and for sinne, condemned sinne in the flesh. The wordes are but fewe, and therefore easie to be remembred, nay therefore better to be considered: God sent his owne sonne: Why? To condemne sinne in the flesh: Why so? Bicause it was impossible to the lawe: wherefore? in as much as it was weake bicause of the flesh. Why then we may conclude, that the Lawe is a burden, and so greeuous a burden, that neither wee nor oure Fathers were able to beare, and that bycause of oure weakenesse. Hereof it is that he sayth in an other place, εἰ γὰρ ἐδόθη νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος. &c. For if there had bin a law giuē which could haue giuen lyfe, surely righteousnesse should haue bin by the Lawe. It is the worke of grace to saue and quicken, the receyuers whereof, although they were extreme

Rom. 8. ver. 3.

Act. 15. verse. 10.

sinners

enemies to the wholesome doctrine of the holy scriptures they become frends. It is not the worke of the doctrine, which whosoeuer heare and reade without the grace of GOD, they are made worse enemies. Therefore the grace of God is not in the nature of free will and in the lawe and doctrine as the peruerse *Pelagian* dothe deceyptfully beleeue and teache: but at euery moment it is giuen by his good will and pleasure, of whom it is sayd: Thou o God sendest a gracious rayne vpon thyne inheritaunce. For we lost both free will to loue god by the greatnesse of our first sinne: and the lawe also and the doctrine thereof, although it be holy and good and iust, yet it killeth if the Spirite do not quicken, by which spirite it commeth to passe that not by hearing, but by obeying, neither by reading, but by louing, it is obserued. For the Lawe without grace, is but a letter, it remaineth to conuince sin, but not to gyue saluation. So sayth the Apostle. For if there had bin a lawe gyuen, whiche could haue giuen lyfe, surely righteousnes should haue bin by the lawe. But the Scripture hath concluded all vnder sinne, that the promise

Psal. 68. vers. 9.

Rom. 7. ver. 12.

Gal. 3. vers. 21. 22.

promise by the faith of Iesus Christ should be giuen to them that beléeue. Of this letter he sayeth in an other place: The letter killeth, but the spirite quickeneth. Thou hast the letter but thou dost not fulfill the letter. And why dost thou not fulfil the letter? Because thou presumest of thy selfe, thou extollest thy workes, thou knowest not that the grace of the helper is necessarie, that the precept of the cõmaunder may be fulfilled. Behold, God hath cõmaunded thée, do that which he commaundeth: thou beginnest to do, as of thyne own strength, and thou fallest, and so remayneth the punishing and not the saning letter. Let vs a little more neare consider this question, what these words import, and what they meane, It is not impossible to fulfil the law: The Law and the Spirit are set as opposite, as killing and quickening, as Moses & Christ, therfore in playne wordes the question is this: Whether it bée possible, without Christ: by the works only of the Lawe whiche we can perfectly and absolutely performe in suche order and manner as GOD hath commaunded, to be saued? And your position is, that wée can if wée

2. Cor. 3. vers. 6.

2. Cor. 3. vers. 6.

Ih. 1, vers. 17

liſt perfectlye as he commaundeth in all poinctes fulfill his Lawe, and ſo purchaſe lyfe vnto oure ſelues, without the quickening ſpirit, without the grace of God. For if you ſaye not this, you ſaye nothing, as you ſhall hereafter more plainely vnderſtand. A preuenting grace and helping you graunt (whereof I will not defraude you) and after permitted to your owne willes you can do what you liſte, and kæpe the commaundements, and purchaſe heauen, & as it foloweth, caſte Chriſt away: Now then let vs ioyne togither: I ſay that thou O Man what ſoeuer thou arte, ſo ſetting Chriſte his death and paſſion a ſyde, of whoſe ſalneſſe we haue all receyued, and ſetting aſyde grace and truthe whiche commeth by Ieſus Chriſt, I ſay that thou cãſt not by any poſſibilitie, if thou ſhouldſt lyue ſeuen hundreth yeares, fulfil the law of GOD, and ſo be ſaued. For if there had bin a Lawe giuen, whiche could haue quickened, iuſtice had bin by the Lawe, neither ſhould a Sauiour bin ſought for, nor Chriſt haue come, nor with his bloud haue ſought his loſt ſhæpe, as the Apoſtle ſayeth in an other place. For if rightuouſ-

Ioh. 1. verſ. 16. 17.

neſſe

nesse be by the Lawe, then is Christ dead in vayne. Let vs consider what is the best of vs, Salomon sayd at the dedicatiō of his Temple: There is no man on the earth which sinneth not. Dauid sayeth, no man liuing shall be iustified before God. Saint Paule plainly affirmeth this, The flesshe coueteth ageinst the spirite, and the spirite ageinst the flesh: and vseth no other reason to proue that all whiche are vnder the lawe are cursed, but this: Bicause it is written, Cursed be they that confirme or fulfill not al these wordes of this law to do them. And such were mē not in their time only, but such is oure nature at this day: ther is no time nor seasō, no houre or momēt, in which we ought not to say, forgiue vs our trespasses, & where forgiuenesse is requisit, ther is no perfectiō, ther is no law fulfilled, there is no saluatiō wrought: neither is it thus to be thought ỳ these & such like sentēces are spokē of men not regenerate & assisted with ỳ grace of god: for Paul speaking of himselfe & of the contention & strife ỳ he felt, sayd: *Non habitare in me, id est, in carne mea, bonū: nā velle adest mihi, sed vt quod bonū est perficiā, nō assequor.* 2. Reg. 8. vers. 46. Psal. 143. vers. 2. Galat. 5. 17. Galat. 3. 10. Deut. 27. 26 Rom. 7. 18. Beda.

Non enim facio bonum quod volo, sed malum quod nolo, hoc ago. For I know that in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me, but I finde no meanes to performe that which is good. Here you may see that the Apostle himself was fraile in body, & that he had as yet no rightuousnesse & perfection. That you may know that ỳ Apostle himself which would saue others, is yet in way of curing, that ye may know that he is yet a curing, if you esteme his honor, marke what emplaister ỳ medicine hath layd to the swelling. Heare not me, heare himselfe confessing, that you may perceyue him teaching. Nowe may I say to the Apostle Paule: Be not proude thou holy Apostle: thou must take heede ỳ thou be not proud. What sayst thou to me saieth he. Heare thou also. Heare what I am, & be not high minded, but feare: heare how the little Lambe may goe in, where
2. Cor. 12. 7 the Ramme is in such daunger. *Ne excellentia reuelationum supra modum efferret, datus est mihi stirculus infixus carni, &c.* Lest I should be exalted, sayeth hee, out of measure thorough the aboundance of Reuelations, there was giuen vnto me a pricke

pricke in the flesshe, the messenger of Sathan to buffit me, bycause I should not be exalted out of measure. Let vs then by this example consider that we are men, let vs acknowledge that the holy Apostles were men, chosen vesselles, but yet frayl, as yet pilgrimes in this flesshe. No doubte but Paule and Dauid, and the residue of the most saincts that euer were, thought this eyther the chefest or the only perfection, if they knewe them selues to be vnperfecte. And you, sayth he, when you haue done al, say we are vnprofitable seruants, we haue done but what we ought to doe. If he be vnprofitable whiche hath done all things, what shal we saye of him which could not fulfill. Therefore the Apostle sayd that he had partly receyued and partly comprehended, and yet was not perfecte, and that he forgate things past, and auanced him selfe to things to come. He that alwayes forgetteth things past and desireth things to come, declareth him selfe not content with things present. But can you shewe me any other that was better in this case, than the Apostle? You say the commaundements, of GOD are easie, and yet you

Hiero. To. 2. ad Chesiph. cont Pelag.

can shew none that hath fulfilled them al. Answere me are they easy or harde? If they be easie, shew me who hath fulfilled them, and why Dauid saith in his Psalms &c. You know where I am. I cut it of because I would be short, and yet must I say something: It followeth, But if they bee hard, why darest thou say that the cõmaũdements are easie, which no man hath fulfilled? Marke this by the way, whiche no man hath fulfilled. And if you think it peraduẽture faultie to reason *Ab esse ad posse* negatiuely, although I might wel answer you that in *attributo specifico* it is no fault, although it be in *individuali*: yet haue I rather to giue you the aunswere of him which may preuayle more with you than myne, and God graunt it may do so. *Dicitis hus verbis. &c.* You say in this sorte: It is an other thing to bee, and an other to may bee, or be possible to bee. To be consisteth not in our power, but to bee able to bee is spoken vniuersally. That although one be not, yet he may bee that will bee. I pray you, what kind of reasoning is this, ẏ thing may be which neuer was? that that may be done, which you witnesse that no

man

man hath done? to attribute that vnto any man, who whither he shall be or no, you know not, & giue I can not tell to whom, that which you cā not proue to haue bin in the Patriarches & Prophetes & Apostles. Do not you perceyue that your assertions are contrarie within themselues? Either they are easie & a great nūber of men haue fulfilled them, or they are harde and you haue rashly sayd, that to be easie which is harde. You are wont to say this also: eyther the cōmaundements are possible and wel giuen of God, *aut impossibilia & in his non esse culpam?* or vnpossible, and no fault in thē which haue receiued the cōmaundemēts, but in him ý gaue those which were impossible. *Nunquid Deus. &c.* Hath god commaunded me to be that which God is, that there should be no difference betwixt men and the Lorde the Creatoure? that I should be higher than the Angels? That I should haue that which the Angelles haue not? Of him it is written as a propertie, whiche did not sinne, and there was no guyle found in his mouth. If this bee cōmō to mee with Christe, what had he proper? Otherwise your sētēce is destroyd of itselfe.

If you think not this whole treatise which I haue alleaged, rightly cited against you, shew me wherin you differ. You say that the commaundementes are possible to be kept, you can shew none that hathe kept them either of the Patriarkes or of the Prophets, or Apostles. You say moreouer, that if God hath commaunded things vnpossible, the fault is in him and not in vs. Seing then ý you accord in al these points with them, you must either shew some farther reason, why S. Hierome may not be deriued against you, or else giue glory to God and cõfesse your error. For to alledge for your selfe that you there in differ from them, because they only graunted *gratiam præuenientem*, and you both that *& adiuuãtem*, it auaileth you not. For the patriarks had that, the Prophets had that, ý Apostles had that and in such sort, that god was vnto them *semper largitor, semperq; donator*, alwayes a liberall giuer, and alwayes a frã giuer, and yet they could not as you there read. I could here bring in more allegatiõs both out of this father and other, but for feare of being to lõg, I leaue them. I trust these few may serue with the help of gods

spirit

spirit to open your eyes & beleue. And thus haue I shewed how they are impossible.

Now to come to my second mẽber, and to shewe you how they are possible & may be fulfilled, I will not stray far away, neither seeke very wide, for that I neede not: I will come home to my first Allegation which sufficeth for dissoluing of this dout: and therefore I chose it moued thereunto, because I see S. Ierome vse the same order: and in eschuing of prolixitie, our rule is good: *frustra fit per plura quod potest fieri per pauciora*: that is vainely done by a longer way, which may be done by easie and short meanes. Let vs then see how the Apostle dissolueth this dout. For that that was impossible to the law in as muche as it was weake because of the flesshe, ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας GOD sending his owne sonne in the similitude of sinful flesh and for sin condẽned sin in the flesh. And in another place καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς &c. & ye which were dead in sinnes, & in the vncircũcision of your flesh hath he quickened together wt him, forgeuing you al your trespalles, and putting out the hand wryting of ordinances that was against vs, which was cõtra-

Rom 8.3.

Col. 2.13.14

ry to vs, he euen toke it out of ỳ way & fast ned it vpon ỳ crosse. &c. Now to cõdemn sin in the flesh, to fasten ỳ hãd writting vpon ỳ crosse, to spoile principalities & powers, to triũph ouer thẽ in ỳ cros, what other thing doth it import, than perfect righteousnesse gotten, than a performing of ỳ lawe? if it be alredy performed, then was it a good cõsequẽt to say it might be performed, & herein we agree. By whõ ỳ Apostle teacheth you, by Christ Iesus, & by him onely, for so is Paules cõsequẽt in these words. For that ỳ was impossible to ỳ law, in as much as it was weake because of ỳ flesh, God sending his son. &c. For ỳ cause why God sent his own son, was the weaknes of our flesh by reason wherof the law could not be fulfilled, & his anger appeased. So then this causeth vs with confidence to say, O death where is thy sting, O hell where is thy victorie? there is no cõdẽnation to thẽ which are in Christ Iesus. And in that, ỳ Christe is our iustification, our sanctification, our peace, wee may say ỳ we fulfil the law, & ỳ no one iote passeth vs nor one pricke in ỳ he forgiueth what wee can not do. And so you haue an other way how the commaũdementes

Aug. li. j. retr. cap. 19.

demẽts are possible. Therfore to come vnto you, I say as you say: ỹ the commandements are possible, & how these words are to bæ vnderstãd that elect vessel doth most playnly teach vs as I alleaged. For that ỹ was impossible, &c. & again, *ex operib⁹ legis*, by the workes of the law no flesh shalbe iustified. And ỹ wœ may not thincke it onely spoken of the law of Moyses, & not of al the cõmandements which are cõprehended in the name of the law, the same apostle witnesseth saying. *Consentio legi Dei.* I delight in ỹ law of God cõcerning ỹ inner mã, but I sæ an other lawe in my members rebelling, &c. O wretched mã ỹ I am, who shall deliuer me frõ ỹ body of death. *Gratia dei ꝑ Iesũ Christũ dñm nostrũ:* it is ỹ grace of god through Christ Iesus O. Feck. For as we are cast doun by one, so must ỹ gift of righteousnes be by one, ỹ is by Iesus christ: and why it cã be but by Christ, ỹ this fulfilling of ỹ law, this righteousnes must be, ỹ Apostle sheweth in an other place οἴδαμεν γαρ for we know ỹ the law is spirituall, but I am carnal sold vnder sin. For I alow not ỹ which I do: for what I wold that do I not, but what I hate that dœ I: and so forth as

Rom. 7. 22.

Rom. 5. 17.

Rom. 7. 14.

it

it folowеth in the whole text. The nature of the moſt godly of all is ſuch, that he can not do as he would. By the ſpirite he may dоо muche, but as long as he is compaſſed with this body of death, he can not dо all. Sо ſayeth the Apoſtle in this place. *Non enim facio bonum quod volo.* I do not the good thing which I would. Do not burden vs, as you haue done in the beginning Maſter Gough, with the errour of the Manicheans and ſuch like whiche trouble the Churche with their wicked phantaſies, ſaying, that that nature is naught, whiche can not bе changed by any meanes, and impute this not to me but to ẏ Apoſtle, who knoweth ẏ God is one, ꝛ man another: the frailneſſe of the fleſh is one, and the ſtrength of the ſpirite an other. Fоr the fleſhe deſireth againſt the ſpirite, and the ſpirite againſt the fleſh: and theſe do ſo ſtriue and contend eche with other, that wе can not dо ſuch things as wе would doe. You ſhall neuer heare of me ẏ nature is naught, but how the fragilitie of the fleſh is to bе reaſoned of, let vs learne of him whiche teacheth. Aſke him why he ſayde, fоr that whiche I would do, that I do not, but the euil which

Hierom. ad Chet. aduer. Pelag.

Rom. 7. 19.

I

I hate, that do I. What necessitie hindreth his will, what force commaundeth him to do things so hatefull, so that, not that which he would, but that which he hated and would not, he is constrayned to dw. He wil aunswere you: O man, what art thou, that so aunswerest God? shall the clay say vnto the potter, why hast thou made me so? hath not the potter power ouer his claye, to make of one lumpe a vessell to honour, and an other to dishonour? Concerning iustice and grace, it may bee well sayd of the giltie whiche is absolued, and of the giltie whiche is condemned. Take that whiche is thine, and go thy wayes, I will giue this man that which is not due vnto him. Is it not lawfull for me to do what I liste? Is thy eye naught, because I am good? Heare yf he should say and why not to me? he shall worthely heare, O man, what art thou that so aunswearest God? whome thou seest towardes one of you to bee a moste bountifull bestower, and towardes thee a most iust eractor, and yet in nether of you vniust. Seing that he should be iust, yf he punished eyther, he whiche is deliuered

Rom. 9. 20. 21. Beda.

Mat. 20. vers. 15.

uered hath to giue thankes, he which is condemned hath not to reprehend. Sure it is, that our flesh is fraple, that our nature is corrupt, and so corrupte, that it letteth vs, that we can not do our dutie, let vs not seeke howe it is so, but as S. Paul him self did, how ye may be deliuered from it, and still cry with our selues,

Ro. 7. 24. *Quis me liberabit de corpore mortis huius,* who shall deliuer me out of the body of this death? you stand vppon the possibilitie of the law: there are diuersitie of gifts as you knowe, can you attaine to all of them? there are many sciences, as Grammer, Rhetoricke, Logike, &c. Who is he of all vs, bee he neuer of so excellent a wit, that can bee a perfect Gramarian, a perfect

Hie. li. j. c. Pelag. Logician, a perfect Rhetorician, a perfecte Philosopher, a perfect lawyer, a perfecte Phisician? the excellent orator & lawyer he sayeth, There are few which attayne one, but both no man can. You see, then that God hath commaunded a possible thing, and yet that whiche is possible, no man can performe by reason of our nature. He hath giuen therfore diuers precepts and diuerse vertues which wee can not

not haue all togither. To bée shorte and to make an ende of this parte, the olde saying is true, *non omnia possumus omnes*, there is none of vs all can dw all things: and there is none or very rare is that riche man, whiche in all his substaunce possesseth all thinges equallye. God hath commaunded possible things, I graunt it. But all these possible things, wæ can not euery one haue, not for the weaknesse of nature (that is, as it was firste made of God) least you slaunder God, but for the wearinesse of minde which can not haue all vertues togither, and alwayes. And thus much touching these two partes, wherby you may vnderstande, how wæ say that the kéeping of the law is possible. And how it is vnpossible. This considered, I come to your argumentes.

Your firste is taken out of the eleuenth of Mathew: and your wordes are these. Contrarie to this doctrine, is our Sauiour Christ, where he willeth vs to take his yoke vppon vs, because it is light. *Tollite iugum meum super vos, iugum enim meum suaue est,*

&

& onus meum leue. Take my yoke vppon you, for my yoke is swete, and my burden is lighte. If it be a light burden, M. Goughs heauy example, hath not a peny worth of good skill.

This is neyther contrarie to his doctrine, M. Fecknam, neyther is his heauy example voyd of skill. But that which causeth you to thincke it to be contrarie, is that you deceyue your selfe, and make a Paralogisme as the Logicians call it, *a fallacia accidentis*, which I shall be able to shew you by your doctours. For you doe not reason with M. Gough *in sensu vniuoco*, and in his proposed matter. He taught you in his sermon that to fulfill the law was impossible, you oppose and lay for an aunswere, that the yoke of Christe is easie. S. Ierome vppon the same place teacheth you that here be *subiecta diuersa*, & therfore in your disputation there is no *vniuocatio*. Your subiectes are *Lex* and *Euangelium*, the lawe and the Gospell, of which two he sayeth thus. *Quo modo leuius lege Euangelium: quum in lege homicidium, in Euangelio ira damnetur? Qua ratione Euangelij gratia facilior, quũ in lege adulterium,*

rium, in Euangelio concupiscentia puniatur? In lege multa precepta sunt, quæ Apostolus non posse compleri plenissime docet. How is the gospell lighter than the law, seeing ỳ murder is condemned in the law, and anger is condẽned in the gospel? How is the grace of the gospell easier, seeing that in the law adulterie, and in the gospell concupiscence is punished? Many things are commaũded in the law, which ỳ Apostle theweth most plainly, that they can not be accomplished. In ỳ law woorks are required, which who soeuer doth, shal liue in thẽ. In the Gospel ỳ will is required, which although it haue not the effect, yet it leeseth not the reward. So that by this Doctor, here is a comparison betwirt the law and the gospel, and as farre difference there is betwirt your two arguments, as is betwirt *velle* and *facere*. And marke then, is this a good argument. *Non possum facere, ergo nó possum velle.* I am not able to do, therefore I am not able to will: or this, *Possum velle, ergo possum facere*, I am able to wil, therfore I am able to do. Take which you wil, these are your arguments. I am sure you see how little holde there is in them: therfore cõfesse the truth,

giue glorie to God, and be not ashamed to haue erred, but be ashamed to remayne in your error. The gospel sure is easier than ỳ law, ỳ grace of Iesus Christ forpasseth & surmounteth the letter. If you will cõsider your heauy burden and come vnto Christ, & craue pardõ for your sins, & haue a mind to walke in his pathes, and where you fall downe desire him to lift you vp, to cloth your nakednesse with his garmente, you shall find reste and refreshing. and this is an easie yoke. But yf you will nedes do, when he requireth the will, you will burden your self with an heauie yoke. I could alleage vppon this same place of Mathew *Theophilact*, and *Glossa ordinaria*, whiche neyther of them take the place as you do, but I passe them ouer because I would be short. You your self may read them.

1. Iohn. 5. Your second argument is of like force. Where you say thus. S. Iohn to this effect sayth. *Quod mandata eius grauia non sunt*. That his cõmandements be not heauy, yf they be not heauy, they be far vnlike M. Goughs lump of lead, impossible to be taken vp and remoued.

It is I say of like sorte, as Nicholas de Lyra interpreting the place of Mathew

doth alleadge out of Augustine, where he sayth thus. *Mandata grauia non sunt, quod exponens Aug. dicit S. amanti:* The commaundementes are not heauy, which S. Augustine expounding sayth, that is, to the louing. S. John sayth so him self in effecte ὅτι πᾶν τὸ γεγεννημενον &c. For all that is borne of God ouercometh the worlde. For in deede the commaundements beyng tempered with the mercie and goodnesse of our heauenly father accepting them all donne, when that is pardoned which is not done, and as Dauid sayth, &c. Chy immecha haselichach For with thee is pardon that thou mayst bee feared. Then to the child of God, to him that hath the victorie of ỹ worlde, that hath Emunah, a sure and a stable faith, that beleeueth in Christ Jesus the son of God, to him the commãdemẽts are not greeuous: nay they are hamnechmadim mizahab more desirous than gold, vinethukim middebasch and sweeter thã honie, & this is ỹ true sense of ỹ place. Aug. ser. 1. 13 Psal. 130. vers. 4. Psal. 19. 11.

Your third is this. S. Paule in rebuking these idle hearers of the law, which say that they can heare it, but not doo it, and fulfill it, writeth. *Non enim auditores legis* Rom. 2.

iusti sunt apud Deum, sed factores legis iustificabuntur. For not the hearers of the lawe be iust with God, but the doers shall be iustified. If they doe the law, then it may be done, then it is possible. *A be esse ad posse* is a good argument. They do works of the law, therfore they may be done.

First touching the scope of the Apostle, you are deceiued. Pardon me, I speake it not of malice or to taunt I protest, but for the truth of the matter. The Apostles purpose is not there to rebuke idle hearers of ỹ law, & say that they can heare it, but not fulfil it: But he goeth about to conclude all vnder sinne, and shew that euery one hath nede of the glory of God: and therfore maketh this occupation. The Iewes can not exempt them selues from this sentẽce, bicause they had the law amongst them. *Nõ enim qui audiunt legem. &c.* For not they, which heare the law are iust with God. &c. And they did not the lawe as it appeareth in the same place. Therefore I maruaile how you conclude out of these words your so strong argument, *Ab esse ad posse.* If you wil nedes folow your owne sense & muse vpon these words, *Factores legis iustificabuntur,*

buntur, the doers of the law shall be iustified: Heare what you haue in *Glossa ordinaria. iustificabuntur. i. iusti deputabuntur: vel iustificient a Deo, vt sint factores. Non qui ante erant factores, post iustificabuntur: vt si dicretur, homines creabuntur, quia ipsa creatione fit vt sint homines. Sic ipsi non qui ante erant factores iustificabuntur quia etiam gentes.* They shal be iustified, that is, they shal be accompted iust: or they shalbe made iust of God: that they may be doers: not which were doers, shalbe iustified. As if it should be sayd, men shalbe created: bicause by the creation they are made men. So likewise not they which were doers before, shall be iustified, bicause the gentiles also. This would I repeat vnto you, as a thing which you know well inoughe, bicause I thinke you haue often read it, for that he sayeth wel and truely, and according to the scriptures, although not verye fit to this place, to the end that you may see how litle it serueth for you, if you be not mynded to follow my first answer, which I thinke and hope you will, if you will loke vppon the place. And here I beseech you in ỹ mercies of Christ Iesus to consider with your selfe

your owne state: I thinke the best of you, I think you haue not the Bible and other bookes about you: If you had you would neuer alleadge places in such sorte, so farre from the purpose of the holy ghost, so little to purpose. I speake it with griefe of hart, the Lord knoweth. I am sorie to see you in such blindnesse: right glad would I be to see the glorie of god appeare in you to your health and saluation, & not to your destruction. Wel the *Glosa interlinealis* goeth farther. *Non enim auditores legis. i. pro auditu legis, sed factores. i. gratia iustificat eos vt adimpleant legem, quia non faciunt vt iustificentur, sed iustificantur vt faciant:* For not the hearers of the law, that is, for the hearing of the law: But the doers, that is, Grace iustifieth thē that they may fulfill ỳ lawe, bicause they do not the law that they may be iustified, but are iustified that they may do it. I shall not nede to stand vpon these wordes *vt adimpleant legē*, that they may fulfill the Lawe) for by that which I haue sayde before, I trust you vnderstand howe they are to be taken. Well let vs go to your fourth Argument.

The

The Euangelist Saint Luke of these doers of the Lawe, bringeth a full example, writing thus of Zacharie and Elizabeth: *Erant ambo iusti ante Deum. &c.* They were both iuste before God, walking in all the commaundementes and iustifications of the Lorde without blame. If S. Luke had the Spirit of truthe, when he sayd that those twoo walked in al the commaundements, then M. Goughe by his deniall and impossibilitie put thereof, must needs haue the Spirite of erroure and lying. Saint Iohn sayeth: *Qui dicit se nosse Deum, & mandata eius non custodit, mendax est.* Hee that sayeth he knoweth God and keepeth not his commaundements, is a lyer. Luc. 1. 6. 1. Ioh. 2. vers. 4.

No doubt, M. Fecknam, but Saint Luke had the Spirite of truthe, and yet hath not M. Goughe the Spirit of errour and lying. He teacheth no contrarie doctrine why you should so conclude. Well let vs examine the wordes and so shall wee see. They were both iust, ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ before God. Not y^t^ god had nothing to lay to their charges putting Christs deliuerãce a syde, not that he had nothing in their liues to find fault withal, his mercie Vide Hiero. lib. 1 cont. Pelag.

being put a parte, *Nõ est qui faciat bonum, non est vsq; ad vnum:* there is not one that doth good (in such sorte) not one. I truste you will not so say. Well how then ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ .i. Before God? You knowe M. Fecknã which are learned in tongues, that this phrase is borowed of ẏ Hebrewe tongue, biphne Iehouah, and that is so to walk in ẏ sight of the Lord, as in the eyes of God. As he sayd: *Si Deos, hominesq; celare possum,* If I could or might hyde this from Gods and men. &c. meaning that hée and she walked vprightly, not as dissembling Hipocrites, not in a faire shewe to the world as others, but their iustice was such as which is done in the sight of God, playn and sincere, without al dubblnesse. And that is, be leb hatum, and not be leb tahur. And this doth partly note vnto you both Theophilactus and Lyra, vpon this place. I referre you to ẏ places: I néed not to recite the words. Let vs goe forward: Walking in all the commandements: *Non quod nõ precauerint* sayth your *Glossa interlinaris. &c.* Not bicause they sinned not, but bicause that thei being wa-

shed

shed with the grace of God left to sinne. I trust you wil not stumble here neither, as though they sinned no more. For if we say so, *veritas Dei non est in nobis*, the truth of god is not in vs: the last word is ἄμεμπτοι *inculpate* blameleſſe. How this is to be vnderſtanded I refer you to Iuſtinus Martyr, in *Solu q.141.* where he hath in effect theſe words. *Iuſtus ex lege dicitur, ὁ γὰρ ἀμαρτάνων παρὰ τὸν νόμον, συγγωσκὴν ἁμαρτίαν, τῇ προσαγωγῇ τῶν θυσιῶν, καὶ τῇ ἐξαγορεύσει τοῦ πλήσματος λαβὼν τὴν ἄφεσιν, γίνεται καθαρὸς, καὶ ἄμεμπτος, κατὰ τὴν ἐκ νόμου δικαιοσύνην. qui cùm peccauerit in ijs quæ poſſunt condonari, ſacrificiorũ oblatione & delicti redemptione, remiſſione accepta mundus efficitur, & a crimine liber.* He is ſaid to be iuſt by the law, who after he hath ſinned in thoſe things which may be forgiuen, hauing remiſſion by the offering of ſacrifice & redemption of ỳ offence is made cleane & free from fault, and ſo are Elizabeth & Zacharie ſaid to be ἄμεμπτοι blameleſſe. Touching your laſt place of S. Iohn. chap. v. I haue ſayd ſufficient before

in the place of ỹ.1. Iohn.chap.v. This wil I adde by the way, ỹ in dæde the knowledge of God can not be without efficacie, and therfore they that brag them selues to be the childrē of God and to haue a fayth, and walke not in his commaundementes, are but lyers. Nowe to your authorities of S. Hierome and Augustine.

Tom. 4. in expos. Symb. ad Damas. & to. 2. in dialog. contra Pel. li. 1. & 3.

S. Ierom wryting of these teachers which sai that it is impossible to kepe the law, hath these words: *Execramur eorū blasphemiā, qui dicunt impossibile aliquid homini à Deo præceptum esse, et mandata eius non a singulis sed ab omnibus in communi posse seruari:* That is: we detest their blasphemie which say that God hath cōmaunded man to doe any thing impossible: and that the commaundements of God may be kept, not of euery one in particular, but of all in generall. He witnesseth that Gods commaundementes may be obserued of euery one in particular, and that God commaundeth nothing impossible: for he detesteth the contrarie doctrine, and calleth it blasphemie, and therfore I haue little cause to like it.

I will not say as other do, & as I might wel,

wel, that this is suspect: I haue his mind in the same question, when he was vrged with the same argument of the Pelagian. *Possibilia inquit, mandata dedit Deus: Et quis hoc negat: Sed quomodo hæc intelligenda sit sententia. &c.* God gaue, sayth he, cõmaundementes which are possible: and who denyeth it. But how this sentence is to be vnderstode, the chosen vessell dothe plainly declare. That which was impossible to the law in as much as it was weak bicause of the flesh, God sending his owne sonne in ỹ similitude of sinful flesh. &c. and in an other place he sayth, *Possibilia præcepit Deus. &c.* God commanded things possible, and I graunte it: but all these possible things, we can not euery man haue. Not for the weakenesse of nature, least thou slaunder God, but for the wearinesse of ỹ minde, which can not haue al vertues togither and always. Therefore if these be both Ieromes, and Ierome be not contrary to him selfe, you muste thus vnderstand youre place that he is to be detested which sayeth that God hath commaunded mã to do any thing that was impossible in it self to be fulfilled, had not ỹ frailnesse

A Crespk. adu. Pelag.

Rom. 8. 3.

of

of mans nature other wayes bin a let; and them also that say that euery one in particular, beyng a true beleeuer, can not fulfill them in him, of whose fulnesse wee all receyue, and whose Iustice is ours by his gifte and grace. And in thus taking of it, I trust you will neyther reiect my aunswere, neyther condemne M. Gough as one of that sort. Now to your place of S. Augustine.

Iohn. 1. 16.

To. 10. ser. 61. de tempore.

S. Augustine likewise to the same ende sayth. *Deus neque impossibile aliquid potuit imperare, qui iustus est, nec damnaturus est hominem pro eo, quod non potuit vitare, qui pius est.* That is: God neyther could commaund any thing that is impossible, who is iust: neyther will he condemne any man, for that which he could not auoyd, who is mercifull. The contrarie whereof to maintaine doth blasphemously argue God, both of iniustice and impietie. When he commaundeth vs to do, which M. Gough saith is impossible and condemneth vs. For that, which he sayth, we could not auoyde.

This place of Augustine is easie enough, and hath in it self sufficient to answere you, not swaruing a whitte from the

the state which I haue made you, and the true meaning of M. Gough. He exhorteth them ther vnto charitie, and reprehendeth withall the foolish tergiuersations and resistances which they made against ỹ scriptures. But a man will say, sayth he, I can by no meanes loue mine enimies. In all the Scriptures, God sayth vnto thee that thou canst: thou on the contrary part answerest that thou canst not. Marke nowe whether should a man beleeue thee or God. And therefore bicause the truthe can not lie, let mannes frailenesse now leaue his vain excuses, *Quia nec impossibile. &c* Bicause he could neither cõmaund any thing which is impossible, who is iust, neyther will condemne man for that that he could not eschue, who is mercifull, it followeth. Why dost thou resist in vaine? *Nemo enim quantum possumus*. For no man knoweth better what we can do or may do, than he that hath giuen vs (*ipsum posse*) that we may. Therefore if the commaundements in themselues are not impossible, but by reason of our weakenesse, and God doths giue vs abilitie in this our defect in suchs sort as I haue declared before, it must

nedes

nedes follow that his iuſtice ageinſt thoſe that do it not is good and iuſt: and this M. Goughe teacheth. He ſaith alſo in the beginning of his Epiſtle. In *reliquis operibus bonis &c.* In other good workes a man may ſometimes pretend ſome maner of excuſe: but in hauing charitie no man can excuſe him ſelfe. A man may ſay vnto me, I can not faſte: Can he ſaye, I can not loue? A man may ſay for the infirmitie of my bodye I can not abſteine from wine & fleſh: can he ſay, I can not loue? A mã may ſay, I can not kepe my ſelfe a virgine: A man may ſaye, that he can not ſell all his ſubſtance and giue it to the poore, can he ſay, I can not loue myne enemies and forgiue thē which haue offended ageinſt me? Let no man deceyue him ſelfe (deare brethren) for God deceyueth no man. For although there be many things, which for the fragilitie of mans nature we can not corporally fulfill, yet without any doubte we may haue charitie in oure hartes God ſo inſpiring it if we will in dēd. Thus you ſee by this place, what we may doe, when God giueth that which he commaundeth, when he worketh that in vs that he requireth,

and

and yet that wée of oure selues can not do so much as kéepe a virgine, as sel our substance, as giue to the poore. And so haue I briefly aunswered your Obiections, without all prolixitie of farther Allegation of moe authorities: desiring you rather to rest your selfe vppon the scriptures, wherevpon we may surely ground our selues, than vpon the wauering iudgement of men in whom you sée verified the common saying, *Quot capita, tot sensus.* So many vnderstandings as be heads: and I woulde it were not so in euery one of them.

2 *That the holie Angels and Saincles of heauen may heare our prayers.*

AS touching this question (M. Fecknam) to saye what I thinke, it is but fond and curious, as sought forth and inuented rather to be some stay and ground to a scisme, thã to edifie the church of God.

For

For no doubt had it bin neceſſarye for vs, the holy Ghoſt would haue made ſome expreſſe mention of it in the canonical ſcriptures, wheras I am ſure you are not able to bring one direct place. But ſuche is the nature of man, readyer to ſeeke out things of no profit, & whiche ſerue to nothing but to ſtrife & diſſention, than to folow ỳ which is left vnto them for their profit. The cauſe of this ſearch hath bin to maintaine your prayer to the ſaincts, which how it folowe-eth of it, if it be to be graunted, we ſhall ſée hereafter. As for that erroꝛ of Vigilantius I had rather erre wt̃ him, than go ſtraight with Hierome, if you can ſhew me no better proofe. To be ſhoꝛt in this fond matter, omitting the varietie of many opinions, as Auguſtines in his booke *de ſpiritu & anima*, where he ſayth thus: *Ibi ſiquidem ſunt ſpiritus defunctorum, vbi non vident, neq; audiunt. &c.* There are the ſpirits of ỳ dead, where they neither ſée noꝛ heare &c. and in diuers other places, & alſo other mennes: alſo letting paſſe other queſtions which enſue hereof: how farre they heare? And what they heare? with ſuch like, I will lay downe this onely which I reade in Hozzóhar,

Hazzohar, His wordes in the *Syrian* tong sound thus word for word. *Tantum sciunt Angeli de rebus nostris, quantum illis datū est & traditum vt sciant.* the angels know so much of our affaires as is giuen and deliuered to them to know. What that is, & when it is, neither you can tell, neither any of yours, that you may make your conclusion auaileable. And for such an vncertaintie whereby your consciences can not be staid to leaue a certaintie and an vnfallyble anker, *Inuoca me in die tribulationis*, cal vpon me in the day of trouble. *Vnus est mediator dei & hominum homo Christus Iesus*, there is one mediator of God and mā, the man Christ Iesus. *Quæcunq; petieritis patrem meum in nomine meo dabit vobis:* What so euer you aske my father in my name he will giue it you: To leaue I say these sure holdes & such like, for that doutful change, what ouersight is it, what contempt of Gods word? As for the consequēt you make hereof. The angels hear vs, *ergo* we may or must pray vnto them. I know not how you thinke in your owne conscience, but to my iudgement it is so strange as the Doctrine it selfe, yea rather more

For no doubt had it bin neceſſarye for vs, the holy Ghoſt would haue made ſome expreſſe mention of it in the canonical ſcriptures, wheras I am ſure you are not able to bring one direct place. But ſuche is the nature of man, readyer to ſeke out things of no profit, & whiche ſerue to nothing but to ſtrife & diſſention, than to folow ỳ which is left vnto them for their profit. The cauſe of this ſearch hath bin to maintaine your prayer to the ſaincts, which how it foloweth of it, if it be to be graunted, we ſhall ſe hereafter. As for that erroꝛ of Vigilantius I had rather erre wt̃ him, than go ſtraight with Hierome, if you can ſhew me no better proofe. To be ſhort in this fond matter, omitting the varietie of many opinions, as Auguſtines in his booke *de ſpiritu & anima*, where he ſayth thus: *Ibi ſiquidem ſunt ſpiritus defunctorum, vbi non vident, neq; audiunt &c.* There are the ſpirits of ỳ dead, where they neither ſe noꝛ heare &c. and in diuers other places, & alſo other mennes: alſo letting paſſe other queſtions which enſue hereof: how farre they heare? And what they heare? with ſuch like, I will lay downe this onely which I reade in

Hozzóhar,

Hazzohar, His wordes in the *Syrian* tong sound thus word for word. *Tantum sciunt Angeli de rebus nostris, quantum illis datū est & traditum vt sciant.* the angels know so much of our affaires as is giuen and deliuered to them to know. What that is, & when it is, neither you can tell, neither any of yours, that you may make your conclusion availeable. And for such an vncertaintie whereby your consciences can not be staid to leaue a certaintie and an vnfallyble anker, *Invoca me in die tribulationis*, cal vpon me in the day of trouble. *Unus est mediator dei & hominum homo Christus Iesus*, there is one mediator of God and mā, the man Christ Iesus. *Quæcunq; petieritis patrem meum in nomine meo dabit vobis*: What so euer you aske my father in my name he will giue it you: To leaue I say these sure holdes & such like, for that doutful change, what ouersight is it, what contempt of Gods word? As for the consequēt you make hereof. The angels hear vs, *ergo* we may or must pray vnto them. I know not how you thinke in your owne conscience, but to my iudgement it is so strange as the Doctrine it selfe, yea rather more

träge. When you shalbe able to make me this a good cõsequent, I wil say as you say: but sooner may you bring heauen & earth together, sooner may you cause the East & the West to mæte, than to bring it to any rule of a good cõsequent. I am sure M. Fek. *ỹ audire et precari*, that is, to hear & to pray, are two accidents, *disparatæ*, ỹ is vnlike & seperated one frõ ỹ other, which depẽd not either of other, *vllo aut prædicationis aut naturæ vinculo*, either *ratione sui*, or *ratione subiecti*. And as good a cõsequent is this, to say, *Crœsus est diues, Ergo Philosophus*, ỹ is, Crœsus is rich, therfore he is a Philosopher, as *Angeli audiunt, Ergo angeli sunt inuocandi*, that is, Angels heare, therefore they are to be called vpon. And vnlesse this cõsequent be admitted, you haue no grounde for this poinct of doctrine. I am loth, I ensure you to stand in this poincte. For any man that shal either heare or reade this, will think rather I speake it to triũphe ouer you (as God knoweth I do not, I wisshe you better) bicause the matter is more playn, thã that it nædeth any suche demonstration. But lesse I could not speak, bicause you so make the collection in your first allegation. For my parte I do as gladly let passe

things not necessarie & of small moment, as other men coulde bee content to haue them buried. Well, for inuocation it self ether of Aungels or saintes, let vs say a worde or two (for to speake much of it at this present it needeth not, for that it hath bin freshly handled by others, & you haue seene it or may) and dispatch this trifling question, whiche breedeth more dissention thã it bringeth profit. First we haue this, that *inuocation* is a peece of Gods seruice due onely to his honour, *inuoca me in die tribulationis*, call vppon me in the day of trouble, and of this he is ielous. *Honorem meum non dabo alteri*, my honour I will giue to none other, & such a peece of Gods seruice it is, that it carieth a belief with it in him on whome ye call, *quo modo inuocabunt, in quem non crediderunt?* how shall they call on him in whom they haue not beleeued? in whom you must beleeue, you are not I trust to learne in this age, but thus much by the way, he muste bee God, *in quem credis*, in whom you beleeue. It is not *cui*, nor *de quo* to whom you giue credit, nor of whom you beleue well. But *credo in quem* that is, in whome If you can

Ro. 10. 14.

find any other inuocatiō but this, I would gladly see it: *non quæro exemplum, quæro, authoritatem*, I seeke not or demaund of you an example or facte, but authoritie. I demaūd no more of you, than you may iustly of me: of our rest and certeyntie, I gyue you these: *Inuoca me in die tribulationis*, call on me in the day of trouble. And oure Sauiour Christ, when you will praye, praye thus: Oure father &c. Not that no other forme of prayer may be vsed, but shewing to whom the prayer must be directed. And ageyne, whosoeuer calleth be schem Iehouah, vpon the name of the Lord, be shalbe saued. And howe this is to be taken if we neither lerne of Christe nor Christian, an old Iewe will teache vs, Rabbi Iodan, god giue vs al this cōfessiō. His words recited in Midrasch tillim be mizmor 4 are these Basar vadam iesch lo pitron higiay lo yeth tzarah eno nichnas lephanau pithom ella ba veyamad al pethach pitrono ve kore le abdo vehu omer, peloni al happethah: ve hacchadosch baruch hu eno chen. higia eth tzara le Israyl lo iehe kore lo le Gabriel, ve lo le Michael, ella kore otho, veh one otho hare hu daamar, col ascher ikra be schem Iehouah

Rabbi Iodan.

houah immalet. That is, flesh & bloud hath a patron in ỳ time of his necessitie, he will not streight way go into his presence, but commeth and standeth at the doze of his patrone, and calleth his seruant, & he telleth his Maister that there is one at the doze. But with God we must not so do. At what time Israel is in affliction oz necessitie, he must neither call to Gabriel noz to Michael, but he must call vppon God, and he heareth him: and this is it that is sayd: whosoeuer calleth on the name of ỳ Lozd, he shalbe saued. But as I sayde, I will not be long herein bicause it were but *Actum agere*, to do that is already done: my purpose is but to run ouer your Arguments.

Youre firste is this: To this opinion is cleane repugnant the saying of our Sauior Christ when he teacheth that more ioy shal be in heauen before the Angels of God vpon one sinner doing penance, than vpon nintie and nine iust men which neede no penance.

First, not to medle with the sense of the place, whiche Christe expresseth by these wozdes of ioy, applying his doctrine vnto our capacitie, I may wel answer you with

a simple denial. The cõsequent is naught, Angels shal reioyce vpon the conuersiõ of a sinner, *ergo* Angels do heare and knowe whatsoeuer we aske and pray: *A futuro ad præsens in meris contingentibus*, you knowe *non valet argumentum*. And it is not *a consequentibus* as you take it. For those Argumentes must be *in pari tempore*. As for Example: *Hæc mulier pariet, ergo concipiet*, this woman shall bring forth, therfore shee shall conceyue. And it is naught to saye *pariet, Ergo concepit*, she shal bring forth, therefore she hath conceyued: vnlesse there be *limitatio temporis*, a limitation and restrainte to the certayne time in which she conceyued: and ỹ *in ijs quæ sunt ex necessitate materiæ*. But *in meris cõtingentibus*, they must be always *eiusdem temporis* at one selfsame time, as *cras pluet, ergo cras nubes erunt*, to morowe it shall rayne, therfore to morowe there shalbe cloudes. But to saye *cras pluet, ergo hodie nubes sunt*, to morow it shal rayne, therfore there are clouds this day, this is no reasõ. For agrément of time being set *posito antecedente, sequitur cõsequens etiam in contingẽtibus*. If one reioyce it is a consequent that he hea-

reth

reth or hath heard, but to say, he shall reioyce to morow, *ergo*, he heareth to day. I can not tell how this consequent hangeth togither. What if I answer you, *facta reuelat Deus, non facienda*: that is to say, God reuealeth things done, & not to be done. What cā you then say? Your place importeth, ỹ God wil make manifest to Angels, how a sinner hath repēted, not that he wil shewe to them that they shall repent. And so had youre Argument ben good: He will make them reioyce for the cōuersion of a sinner, therfore he wil shew thē ỹ conuersion of a sinner. I say vnto you, your place doth importe this, ỹ *facta reuelat Deus, non facienda*. They shall reioyce for a sinner returned, not for a sinner that shall returne. I knowe that God hath reuealed vnto his seruaunts things past and things to come, but when he doth it, or whether he doth it alwayes, I say you knowe not, and therefore your collection is naughte. Where you say, neyther yf they knowe our penaunce, shall they bee ignoraunt of our petitions: I saye your collection is naught, although I touch not ỹ false kind of reasoning, which is *à conclusione hypo-*

thetica ad categoricam, in materia cõtingẽti.
And therfore you are mad men in praying vnto thẽ, vnlesse you haue some more sure and certaine grõũd than this: and they are no mad men which make them so ignorãt: for vnlesse god doth reueale it vnto them, they know in a manner no more than we do: and when he doth reueale it vnto them and how muche, and in what cases, when you can certifie me and others, we wil beleue it. In the meane season if we suspend our faith vntil we haue a better rest for it, I pray you do not call vs mad men. But now for the sense of the place. Doth he not in those three parables set forth vnto vs ỹ care that he hath of his churche, in that he of his singular loue sæketh vs whẽ we go astray from him: He laboreth to finde vs, when we be lost: and is ready to receyue vs when we turne vnto him: and thereby also aduertise vs of our duetie, to sæke the helpe and saftie of eche other, not to condemne the wãderers which go astray but by his example to sæke meanes to bring them vnto Christ, that in so doing being members bothe of one body, we may reioyce togither and glorifie God, we may

haue

haue that cõsolation & comfort, which bre-
thren ought to haue, and especially those
which are the childrẽ of God: To moue vs
to this duetie, he setteth before vs ỳ doing
of that part of the church which is better, &
which is in heauen, he setteth before vs I
say the doing of the Angels, who as they
be mẽbers of this body, so do they reioyce,
when they sæ that cõsent and conformitie
in the members, which ought to be in so
pretious a body. If then they be ioyous and
glad that sinners do repẽt, what ought we
to do, which are present with them, & sæ-
ing their infirmities may cõsider our own,
and by mercy shewed to them, be more cõ-
firmed in the graces of God? This I say is
the sense of the place. Now then because
we are here instructed of the charitie and
loue, which is and ought to be in ỳ churche
of God and members of Christes body, be-
cause there is a true ioy and gladnesse eche
with other, when God bestoweth his gra-
ces, which before sæmed to be shut vp: be-
cause this συμπαθεια that is, natural and
mutuall agræment, is not only in the mẽ-
bers on the earth, but in those also which
are in heauen: will you therfore conclude

that things done here on earth, and words spoken, are heard and knowne vnto them at all times and seasons, as yf they were heades and not members, Gods and no Aungels? For to see our harts & thoughts, to heare our sighes and wordes is a property of Gods nature, geuen vnto no Angell, but when he reuealeth it vnto him: & that not alwayes, but as he shall thinke it expedient both for them and vs: and as for such reuelations, this place sheweth it not, this only is here declared, what charitie and loue there is in the true members of Christe his body, and the fruict therof, God working as well in them as in vs a knowledge of things done, and gladnesse therefore. And thus muche touching this place of Luke. xv. whereof you can neyther cōclude that thei do continually here vs, neyther yf they did, that we shuld pray therfore vnto them.

Your next argument is out of Tobie, 12. This also is refelled by the saying of the Angell Raphaell vnto Tobie. *Quando orabas cum lachrymis & sepeliebas mortuos, &c.* When thou prayedst with teares, and buriedst the dead, and forsokest thy dynner, and

and hiddest by the day dead folkes in thy house, and buriedst them in the night, I did offer thy prayer vnto the Lorde. All these things the Angell Raphael did know, when Tobie thought lest hereof: and what? shall wee aduenture to say, that the Angel knew it onely, and affirme that no other Angell doth knowe the like, or shall the Aungels knowe it, and not the glorified sainctes of God, when he promiseth of them, that in the resurrection they shall be like Angels? Matt. 22.

I muse at this kind of dealing (M. Fecknam) I might say vnto you, *vna hirundo non facit ver*, one swalow maketh not sõmer: but that is not the matter: to see all things that are done of vs, or to heare vs, is it *natura Angelorum*, the nature of the Angels? or is it *speciale donum*, a speciall gift. What kind of reasoning is this, *in accidentibus communibus* to reason *ab vno individuo ad speciem*, or *à specie ad genus*. Were this a good argumente to say, *Socrates Philosophus verè sentit de summo bono, Ergo, omnes Philosophi verè sentiunt de summo bono?* Socrates the Philosopher iudgeth truely or a righte of the chiefest good, or

or happinesse, therfore all Philosophers iudge and thinke truely therof. Yours is the same. Raphaell saw his doyng, therfore all ỳ Angels saw Tobie his doings, & *per consequentiam*, cõsequently, they see ours. I see not (Master Fecknam) why I may not deny *consequentiam & consequens*, that is, both your conclusion and that which you woulde inferre thereof. For neyther doth it folow, yf Raphaell saw Tobie, therfore all did see him, neyther yf they sawe his doyngs, therefore they see ours. For as I sayd, it is neyther the nature of an Angel, neyther the propertie of an angell: of whiche two there must bee one to make an argument good *à specie ad genus*, or by an induction. Thus much touching your kind of reasoning, in groũding an article of religion, which hath no other ground of scripture for his warrant. I marueyle that the aungell Act. 10 ver. 3 whiche appeared to Cornelius made nothing to your purpose. For he sawe him in a vision, and declared vnto him how his matters went. Therefore you might haue concluded some thing. But wil you know, why he is out of your rolle? Be-

cause

cause he sayd, thy prayers and thine almes are come vp into remembraunce before God: he did not say, I did carie vp thy prayers. And yet I wisse you might haue as well concluded by this, *ergo* the angels know what wee do. Euen both a like, when God sendeth them, when god openeth vnto them, I thinke they know. And surely to bee noted it is, that the aungell sayth not, I knew, I saw, I caried thy prayers: but, thy prayers are come, to gyue vs to vnderstande that as they are but messengers, so we can not, nor ought assure our selues more of thē than their master willed them to reuele vnto vs. Now to your author, who as you alleadge is Tobie, whose authoritie cited as scripture I deny it, I finde no such author in my Bible. I meane not the *Geneua* Bible, whereat diuerse of you list to leasl, but I would you could shewe a better in our tongue, or iustly correct it: I meane that Bible, which is deuided into these partes, *CH. CH. T. NR. NA. MG. Hac*: If he were in this nūber, I would not, neyther could I reiect him as not scripture, as not written with

That is, the 5. bookes of Moyses, the first Prophetes, the last Prophetes, the litle volumes, the holy wrytings.

with the finger of God: but bicause I finde him not, I dare not be so bolde as to make him felow with ẏ holy ghost, to groũd my faith vpõ him as vpon the holy scriptures: & how you ought to read him & such others and vse him Hierom doth teach you, I need not repeate it. And this for Tobie. Now touching your allegatiõs out of ẏ 4. Reg. 6 of the reuelation ẏ was giuen to Elizeus, touching the secretes of the king of Syria, and Act. v. the reuelation to Peter of ẏ secrete thoughts of Ananias, I know not to what purpose they make touching your question: these places & many mo shew vnto vs how boũtifully God hath poured his spirit vpon his seruants the Prophets and Apostles at diuers & sundry times, for the helpe & comfort of his church: but to proue either an intelligence continual ẏ the Angels haue of our affaires, or for vs to pray vnto them, they serue nothing at all. I beseeche you what wil you conclude: God reueled the secretes of the king of *Syria* to Elizeus, and of Ananias to Peter. Therfore he reuealeth to ẏ Angels our doings, therfore we must pray to them and to the Sainctes? What dealing is thys? You

heape

heape here an other place of S. Augustine to as much purpose *Si Prophetæ, nondum facta nosse potuerunt, per hoc quod erat Deus, (quantulacunq; erat) in eorum mortalium mentibus, quo modo immortales sancti, iam facta, tum nescient, cùm erit Deus omnia in omnibus?* If the Prophetes coulde know things before they were done, by this that God was(how much so euer he was) in the mindes of them as yet beyng mortall, how shall they not know then things that bee done already beyng, immortall sainctes, when God shall bee in them all in all? You see euidently ỹ he speaketh here howe & in what case they shal be in the latter daye, when in deed ỹ shal be rightly verified, ỹ he shall bee all in all. And what doth this impugne ỹ saying of S. Gough? who denieth not ỹ in ỹ latter day we shall see God face to face, we shall most fully see & know that which neyther eye hath seen, neyther eare hath heard, neyther at any time hath it entred into ỹ hart of man. A more ful knowledge, a more ample sight, a better vnderstãding thã this you cã not haue. This we graũt, yours we deny. We graũt this also, ỹ we may make an end, & come to your arguments)

To. 5. de ciuit Dei, lib. 20. cap. 22.

Heb. 1. 14. Psal. 91. 11. Psalm. 34. 7

guments) that the angels which God hath commaunded to waite vppon vs, to guide vs in all our wayes, to be round about vs, to admonish vs and comfort vs, to watche perpetually for our sauegard, these angels see and know what we do, frō the vtmoste action, to the inwardst thought, if God so dispense vnto them, and make them his ministers, who is the sole and only searcher of hearts and raines, knower of thoughts and mindes: and yet foloweth it not, that we must pray to them: neither yet, that other Saincts do know what we do or thinke. I say the dead, the saincts, do no more know what we do here while it is in doing, than we know what they do: and when they know any thing, it is by after information, or by the ministerie of the Angels, as in like case they minister vnto vs. So that certaintie you can haue none to sound your prayers vpon: for while you are praying, they do not knowe.

And although you may alledge me som visions which may seeme to confirme your purpose, putting the case I should graunt them: yet can you no more proue that they knowe and vnderstand our doings, than

than if in your dreame you should haue a thing opened vnto you by one which was slæping when you slept, & nothing thought of you. What if they haue care for vs being there, as requisite to, for that they bee mẽbers with vs, and charitie ceaseth not: Do they therfore know what wée do? we haue care of them also, and yet wée know not what they doe. We loue them as whẽ they were here, we laude and magnifie God, that he hath dealt so louingly with thẽ, we reioyce that they are already partakers of that, whiche we loke & hope for, running the same race of faith and feare of God. This care I saye we haue of them, thus in charitie wée are affectioned towardes them, & yet knowe we not what they doe: no more do they, what we doe. Wel, nowe lette vs come to youre Arguments of Doctors.

Mayster Gough, say you, to proue that no Saints being dead can heare vs, alleadged the saying of the Prophet Isai. &c. *Abrahã nesciuit nos. &c.* That is, sayth M. Goughe, Now after they be dead they haue no maner of knowledge of vs, but be cleane ignorant of things done here vpõ the earth. But

S. Hierome hath an other interpretation, which I thinke I may prefer before master Goughs saying, *Abraham nescuit nos. 1. Abraham non agnouit nos pro filijs.* Abraham hath not knowne vs, that is, Abraham hath not allowed or acknowledged vs for hys children: and why? *Quia te offendimus:* because we haue offended thee, saith S. Ierom. He saith not, *quia Abraham & Israel mortui sunt.* Because Ahraham & Israel be dead, as if thereby they coulde haue no longer knowledge of them?

What if S. Hierom haue an other, is M. Goughes therefore naught? Nay, but you had rather prefer S. Ieromes. Do you think that M. Gough hath no authoritie for his? Do you thinke that he hath not as good as S. Hierome? If you think so, I will giue you to vnderstand the contrary. If you do not thinke so, why do you conceale the truthe, and stand rather vpon man than vpon the word of God? This is the miserie that you haue, that whileſt you will not hearken to the scriptures, but what this man or that man sayth, you wauer vp and down, now alleaging one man, now an other, not knowing wel where to stand. Wel, I will bring

bring you two, neither to be misliked in such cases, the one comparable to Hierome in all respectes. First Kimki on this place sayth: al derech, abi ve immi. &c. On this sort is it spoken in an other place, *Pater meus & mater mea dereliquerunt me, Dominus autem assumpsit me. Quamuis enim pater noster Abraham multis iam preterlapsis seculis mortuus sit, & pater carnalis non nouerit filium aut nepotem suum nisi dum viuit, tu tamen pater noster viuis & duras de seculo in seculum, ita vt opus non sit nobis clamare nisi ad te, & per omnes etates tam quæ preterierunt quàm quæ futuræ sunt, tu es pater noster, tu redemptor noster ex omni afflictione & in perpetuum nomẽ tuum erit super nos:* That is, my father and my mother haue forsaken me, but ỹ Lord hath gathered me vp. For although our father Abrahã were dead many many yeares agoe, and a carnall Father doth not know his sonne or his nephew but while he liueth, yet thou O father liuest and remainest for euer, so that we haue no nẽd to cry vnto any other but vnto thee, & through out al ages as wel forepassed as to come, thou art our father,

thou art our redæmer out of all trouble, & thy name shall be vpon vs for euer. The
Cap. 13. other is S. Augustine, whome you néd not to haue concealed, if you had mynded the truth. But if you shuld haue alleaged them bothe, you could not haue tolde which way to haue gone. Giuing his definite mynd & sentence vppon these matters and questions, he sayth thus: *vt volet accipiat quisq; quod dicam. &c.* Let euery man take as he listeth, that which I will say: If the soules of the departed did meddle with the affairs of the liuing, & did speake vnto vs when we sée them in visions, to hold my peace of other, my louing mother would no night forsake me, which folowed me by Sea and by land, that she might liue with me. For God forbid that she should be made with a happie life so cruel, that when any thing grœueth my heart, she should not comfort hir heauie sonne, whom she would neuer sée sad. But surely that is true which the godly Psalme sayeth: My father and my mother haue forsaken me, but the Lord hath gathered me vp. Therfore if our fathers haue forsaken vs, how do they communicate with our cares and affairs? and

if

if our Parents do not communicate or do not meddle, what other are there of the dead, which know what we doe, and what we suffer? Esay the Prophet sayeth, for thou art our Father: For Abraham hathe forgotten vs, and Israell doth not knowe vs. If so great Patriarkes did not knowe what was done to the people begotten of them, to whome beleeuing God, the people was promised of their stocke, how do the dead know and helpe the affaires and doings of others? How say we ý they were well dealt withall, which died before adnersitie came, which followed their death, if so be that also after death they feel what so euer things come to passe in the calamities of mannes lyfe? Or peraduenture we erre in so saying, and we thinke those quiet whome the vnquiet lyfe of the lyuing doth grieue. And so forth alleaging as you knowe to the same purpose the promisse made to Iosias, and so concluding sayeth thus. *Ibi ergo sunt spiritus defunctorum, vbi non vident quæcunq; aguntur, aut eueniunt in ista vita hominibus.* Therfore the soules of the dead are there, where they see not whatsoeuer things are

S. Hierome hath an other interpretation, which I thinke I may prefer before master Goughs saying, *Abraham nescuit nos. i. Abraham non agnouit nos pro filijs.* Abraham hath not knowue vs, that is, Abraham hath not allowed or acknowledged vs for hys children: and why? *Quia te offendimus:* bicause we haue offended thee, saith S. Ierom. He saith not, *quia Abraham & Israel mortui sunt.* Bicause Abraham & Israel be dead, as if thereby they coulde haue no longer knowledge of them?

What if S. Hierom haue an other, is M. Goughes therefore naught? Nay, but you had rather prefer S. Ieromes. Do you think that M. Gough hath no authoritie for his? Do you thinke that he hath not as good as S. Hierome? If you think so, I wil giue you to vnderstand the contrary. If you do not thinke so, why do you conceale the truthe, and stand rather vpon man than vpon the word of God? This is the miserie that you haue, that whilest you will not hearken to the scriptures, but what this man or that man sayth, you wauer vp and down, now alleaging one man, now an other, not knowing wel where to stand. Wel, I wil

bring you two, neither to be misliked in such cases, the one comparable to Hierome in all respectes. First Kimki on this place sayth: al derech, abi ve immi. &c. On this sort is it spoken in an other place, *Pater meus & mater mea dereliquerunt me, Dominus autem assumpsit me. Quamuis enim pater noster Abraham multis iam preterlapsis seculis mortuus sit, & pater carnalis non nouerit filium aut nepotem suum nisi dum viuit, tu tamen pater noster viuis & duras de seculo in seculum, ita vt opus non sit nobis clamare nisi ad te, & per omnes etates tuas quæ preterierunt quàm quæ futura sunt, tu es pater noster, tu redemptor noster ex omni afflictione & in perpetuum nomẽ tuum erit super nos:* That is, my father and my mother haue forsaken me, but ỳ Lord hath gathered me vp. For although our father Abrahã were dead many many yeares agoe, and a carnall Father doth not know his sonne or his nephew but while he liueth, yet thou O father liuest and remainest for euer, so that we haue no nẽd to cry vnto any other but vnto thẽ, & through out al ages as wel forepassed as to come, thou art our father,

thou art our redéemer out of all trouble, & thy name shall be vpon vs for euer. The
Cap. 13. other is S. Augustine, whome you néed not to haue concealed, if you had mynded the truth. But if you shuld haue alleaged them bothe, you could not haue tolde which way to haue gone. Giuing his definite mynd & sentence vppon these matters and questions, he sayth thus: *vt volet accipiat quisq; quod dicam. &c.* Let euery man take as he listeth, that which I will say: If the soules of the departed did meddle with the affairs of the liuing, & did speake vnto vs when we sée them in visions, to hold my peace of other, my louing mother would no night forsake me, which followed me by Sea and by land, that she might liue with me. For God forbid that she should be made with a happie life so cruel, that when any thing grœueth my heart, she should not comfort hir heauie sonne, whom she would neuer sée sad. But surely that is true which the godly Psalme sayeth: My father and my mother haue forsaken me, but the Lord hath gathered me vp. Therfore if our fathers haue forsaken vs, how do they communicate with our cares and affairs? and

if

if our Parents do not communicate or do not meddle, what other are there of the dead, which know what we doe, and what we suffer? Esay the Prophet sayeth, for thou art our Father: For Abraham hathe forgotten vs, and Israell doth not knowe vs. If so great Patriarkes did not knowe what was done to the people begotten of them, to whome beleeuing God, the people was promised of their stocke, how do the dead know and helpe the affaires and doings of others? How say we ỹ they were well dealt withall, which died before aduersitie came, which followed their death, if so be that also after death they feel what so euer things come to passe in the calamities of mannes lyfe? Or peraduenture we erre in so saying, and we thinke those quiet whome the vnquiet lyfe of the liuing doth grieue. And so forth alleaging as you knowe to the same purpose the promisse made to Josias, and so concluding sayeth thus. *Ibi ergo sunt spiritus defunctorum, vbi non vident quaecunq; aguntur, aut eueniunt in ista vita hominibus.* Therfore the soules of the dead are there, where they see not whatsoeuer things are

done or come to men in this lyfe. Thus then you needed not haue in such sort cast off Walter Gough, as though it were a heauie comparison betwixt him and Hierom. He is as you see, as wel to be thought of as Hierome, in that he hath for his part the whole Scriptures, these two learned men. Other I do not recken vp, you your selfe acknowledge in your selfe that I might bring more: But in this varietie of men, what certaintie can you haue for your conscience, if you do not at the length come to the Scriptures? Wherein you can not find one word well taken, whereby you may proue that the dead doe know our doings, vnlesse it be by especiall Reuelation, or worke of GOD, which you can neuer drawe to a rule.

As for the prosecuting of that manner of speache, I doe not know you, for, I doe not acknowledge you: I thinke there is no man so enuyous, but will graunt you that truthe. *Sed quorsum illa*, to what purpose is that? Although it be so taken in very many places, yet why it should be so taken there I see no reason. I speake what

what I thinke, I knowe there be interpreters as well one way as other. But the circumstance of the text in my minde draweth that way. You go further.

If this will not satisfie master Gough, let him heare Sainct Augustine: who sheweth vppon occasion of thys place, in what manner the Sainctes doe heare vs. *Per diuinam inquit potentiam Martyres viuorum rebus interſunt. &c.* By diuine power the Martyres are heere present in the doings of those that be alyue, for being dead by their owne proper nature to bee present in the doings of those that be aliue, they can not. To. 4. de cura agend. pro mort. cap. 16.

Nowe you some thing chaunge your state, and make *Duo predicata*, where before you made but one. Your first conclusion was, That the Sainctes and Angels may or doe heare our Prayers: Now you put in may by diuine power heare our Prayers: And so you committe a fault which is called, *A ſecundum quid ad ſimpliciter*. Againe in *Accidentibus communibus a ſpecie ad genus*, saying thus. The Martirs do heare vs: therfore al Sainctes.

For your Doctor in your owne place alleaged, maketh a difference betwixt them in this matter and sayeth. *Non igitur ideo putandum est vitiorum rebus, quoslibet interesse posse defunctos, quoniam quibusdam sanandis vel alluuandis martyres adsunt: sed ideo potius intelligendū est, quod per diuinam &c.* Therfore it is not for that cause to be thought that euery one that is dead, can be present in the doynges of those that bee aliue: because the Martyres are present in healing and helping of some. But therfore rather it is to bee vnderstode, that by the deuine power the martyres are present in the doyngs of those that bee aliue, because the dead by theyr owne proper nature can not bee present in the doyngs of those that bee alyue. He concludeth a cleane contrarie position to yours, saying that the martyrs are presente, because the saincts can not bee. And how the Martyres be present he sheweth in these wordes, *per diuinam potentiam*, by diuine power. For this is not orderly, but as he sayd before, *verū ista diuinitus exhibentur, longe aliter quàm sese habet vsitatus ordo singulis creaturarum generibus attributus* But these are exhibited from

from God far otherwise, than the accusto-
med maner is, whiche is giuen to all kind
of creatures. For not bycause that water
was sodaynely turned into wine when
God would: therfore we ought not to dis-
cerne what water is in the proper order
of elementes, from the singularitie and
strangenesse of this heauenly worke. Take
the best of this for your purpose, yet can
you not come to that you woulde, to make
any certayne rule, no not in the very mat-
yres. And so likewise touching this mat-
ter, he confesseth of him self, that it passeth
his vnderstanding. Leaue therefore these
vayne speculations, and content your self
with that whiche God hath taught you:
you are sure that Christ doth & will heare
you, when soeuer you call on him in truth
and veritie: you are sure that what so euer
you aske in his name, it shal be giuen you, Ioh. 14.
that the Father may bee glorified: why
then, rest vppon this suretie, go not a stray
when you may go right: differre not your
self to the night, when you may walke in
the light.

After this you descend from debating
the matter by scripture and reason & au-

thorities *ad factū*, what thei did (as though this question betwixt vs and you were *facti*, what hath bin done, and not rather as it is in deed, *iuris*, what of right & lawfully may and ought to be done) to whiche purpose you alleadge two places oute of Augustine, one out of Gregorie Nazianzene, one out of Origine, one out of Ephrem, one of Hierome, one of Chrisostom, whose doings bicause they haue no ground in gods word, neither better and more sure reasō than S. Augustine alleageth, which are not sufficient for mee to rest my conscience vpon: & yet your promises being graūted, ẏ conclusion is very wyde. I wilbe you better to consider the case you stand in, & pardon me that I disalowe them. For this I learne by Augustine, that to speake in *genere* of the departed, *nescire quidem mortuos quid hic agatur*, That the dead can not tell what is done here, whilest it is doing, & if they know, it is after by relatiō (saith he) of thē which go frō hence vnto them: & yet not all, but such things as they are suffered to tell, and whiche they were suffered to remember: and suche as they ought to heare, to whome they tell them, or else by

Cap. 14. 15. 16. De cura pro mor. ag.

the

the Angels whiche are here present with vs, & at oure doings, they may heare some thing which he thinketh mete and conuenient to whom all things are subiecte. If therefore he himself teache vs this, that they do not know or they know after, and not all, but such as are necessarie for them to knowe, and as he thinketh expedient that is master of all: If he do contrarie to his doctrine commend his prayers to thē whiche as yet heare him not, and when they shall or whither they shall at all, he knoweth not: you must giue me leaue to followe his doctrine, if I thinke it better than his example. His doctrine importeth some thing, his example nothing. Do as they teach you which sitte in Moses seate, but do not as they do. And thus much touching this question. God giue vs eyes to see, and hartes to vnderstande, that if you be out of the way (as you shewe your selfe to be) you may come in: If I my selfe (as I am perfectly persuaded I am not) that he will giue me grace to conuert. And so pray I for vs both.

3 *That onely fayth doth not iustifie.*

MAster Gough likewise in few wordes, woulde vehemently haue persuaded, lyke as others heretofore him, that sole fayth or onely fayth doth iustifie vs. So did long agoe teache Eunomius of that fayth which he professed, as S. Augustine reciteth in his 6. Tom. de Hæresibus.

Hæres. 54.

In so doyng as others haue done before him, as Moyses, as Christ, as Paul, as all the Prophetes and Apostles in teaching the Iustification of fayth onely, yf you expound him not amisse, he did the part of a faythfull Minister and preacher of Gods word. But you are disposed in this matter, as in others, to carpe and cauill, euill construing that which is wel spoken. You ioyne your wordes in this sorte, sole faith or only fayth. There is great difference in these two kindes of speaking: a sole fayth is a barren, an vnfrutefull, a wicked, a diuelish fayth: which in dede is no fayth, it hath but the glistering and shew of fayth, it is but a lippe fayth: and where so euer it is

What a sole faith is.

is, I warrant you, there is *Corde non creditur*, no belæf in hart. Fayth only is an other manner of thing, it is that which the Hebrewes cal Emunah that is, a faith stable and sure, as it is sayd of Moyses, Exod. 17. ὑπόστασις ἐλπιζομένων, *& manus eius erant firmæ & stabiles vsq; ad occasum solis*, & his handes were steady and stable vntill the goyng downe of the sun. So doth Paule Hebr. 11. terme it vaichi iadan emunah the cõmon translation hath *substantia:* it is that *quod facit vt extent quæ sperãtur*, which maketh those things to exist which are hoped for. This fayth can bée no more without fruytes, than can the body bée without the soule, to be a liuing body, so that ther be time: for wée knowe that vocation is diuerse, some in the morning, some at none, some at night are called, and these lasse because they are so sone cutte of, that they could not but beleeue, and not glorifie God before vs, wée muste not therefore condemne them. This fayth I say most florishing and decked with gorgious workes, as shining both before God and man as the lilie, doth only iustifie, doth only apprehend the iustification

of

of God giuen in Christ Iesus oure Sauiour, doth trulie bring Christe into vs, and vs into him. So the faithfull man seing himselfe purged from all his former sins and offences, walketh in newnesse of lyfe in the wayes that God hath ordeyned for him: that before men he may glorifie his father which is in heauen. This faith Eunomius did not teache: he was in his opinion a naughtie and wicked man, as were many moe in the time of S. Augustine, & are now: God make them fewer. He writeth of him and others in this wise. I wil laye his wordes before you, that you your selfe may iudge, whither you do rightly burdē vs with Eunomius or no. *Apostolus predicans iustificari hominem per fidem sine operibus, non bene intellectus est ab eis, qui sic dictum acceperunt, vt putarem cùm semel in Christū credidissent, etiāsi malè operarētur, & facinerosè, flagitioseq; viuerent, saluos se esse per fidem posse,* that is, The Apostle preaching that a mā is iustified by faith without workes, was not well vnderstode of
Lib. quæſt. 83 them which toke his saying in this sorte, that they thought they might be saued by faith, whē they had once beleeued in christ, al-

although they did wickedly, although they liued most detestably and villenously. And in an other place, *Non cogimur dicere iniustis, non subdutis, scelestis, contaminatis, parricidis; matricidis; homicidis, fornicatoribus, masculorum concubitoribus; plagiarijs, mendacibus, periuris, & si quid aliud sanæ doctrinæ aduersatur, quæ est secundum Euangelium gloriæ beati Dei, si tantum in Christum credatis & sacramentum Baptismi eius accipiatis etiamsi vitam istam pessimam non mutaueritis, salui eritis.* We are not constrayned to say to the vniust, to the rebellious, to the wicked, to the defiled, to the murderers of father & mother, to manslayers, to fornicators, to buggers, to mē stealers, to lyers, to ỹ periured, & if there be any other thing which is contrarie to the wholsome doctriue whiche is according to the glorious Gospell of the blessed God, if you beléue onely in Iesu Christe, and receyue his Sacrament of Baptisme, although you chaunge not this wicked lyfe, you shal bee saued. This was Eunomius opinion and his fellowes, it is not ours. Our Preachers teach that faith only iustifieth, & yet not that a sole faith iustifieth, ther- De fide & op. Cap. 16. Tom. 4.

therefore in so expounding his wordes as you do, you do deceyuablie commit an Eleuche which we cal *fallatia accidentis*. For whereas we say fayth iustifyeth only, that is, no other thing doth apprehend the iustice which GOD doth giue vs, but oure faith: you turne it and make this sense, a bare faith voyde and destitute of all godnesse doth attayne to the mercies of God. Which in dede is an heresie. For as the other is good & allowable, according to the scriptures, There is no condemnation to them whiche are in Christe Iesus, whiche walke not after the flesshe, but after the Spirit: so is this wicked and naught. For if we liue after the flesshe, we shall dye. And thus much to shewe that we are no *Eunomians*. Now to your Arguments.

Ro. 8. 1. 13.

To confirme his opinion out of the scriptures, he brought the saying of the Apostle: *Arbitramur iustificari hominem per fidem sine operibus Legis*. We thinke or determine that a mā is iustified by faith without the workes of the Law. Concluding by this testimonie of S. Paule, that workes do in no manner of wyse iustifye vs, not onely those which go before fayth, but also those which

Rom. 3.

which do folow faith: for touching any iustification of works, he maketh the like cõdition of them both.

His allegation was good and his argument good. For it foloweth wel, we are iustified by faith: Therfore workes done before do not iustifie, neither workes after. This consequẽt you wil not deny simply, for all your allegaciõs you bring, do proue that workes before do conferre nothing to iustification. For the Apostle preaching to the Gentiles, saith: When he sawe them that came to the lord iustified by faith, that now they which did beleue, should worke, and do good dedes, and not because they had done well, they deserued to beleue, he cried out and said boldly, That man may be iustified by faith, without the workes of the law. Your sticking is vpõ workes that folow: as in dede, not knowing what difference is betwixt iustification and sanctification, you should doubt whether sanctification were a piece of iustification, or an effect of iustification. Let vs then se, whether workes that follow do conferre any thing to the Iustification. Marke I pray you the controuersie betwixt you and ma- Beda.

ster Goughe. The question is not whether good workes are necessarie to walke in: Whether we are bound to walke in the feare of GOD, after that he hath manifested vnto vs his election, and called vs to embrace his free mercy and Iustification? I say, the question is not, whether we ought to do well that GOD may be glorifyed by vs? But whether a man being already iustified, his workes afterward may giue encrease of Iustice? I pray you Sir after that Queene Marie had made you Abbot of Westminster, dyd you the office of an Abbot, that you would be a more Abbot, or to do your duetie; to the which the Queene of hir grace hadde called you. For therefore shee bestowed it vpon you, that you should doe the duetie, and not dy doing the duetie to become a more Abbot.

So fareth it with the children of God: Of this whole lumpe of earth which he made of this masse, which we call Adam: he of his free mercie and goodnesse hathe chosen some whereby he will be glorified in this world, by the good workes which

which they shall do before the face of men. When this election of his beginneth to be manifest to everye chosen, when he moueth the hearts of his after they haue long slept in sinne, to remember that they are hys, that he hathe slayne hys Sonne for them, that they are deliuered from the whole curse of the lawe: Is it not requisite thinke you, that they walke worthie his vocation? What they make sure their vocation? Haue doe they in this their course, in any parte delyuer them selues from the curse of the lawe? Doe they pay that raunsome which was paide before? What is the iustice or Iustification of GOD? Redemption and remission of sinnes in the bloud of Christ. Was then the bloud of Christ answearable to all the Lawe, did there remaine no parte vnpayde? For whome then did he all this? Not for him selfe, for there was no guile found in his mouthe: For whome then? For the faithfull, to whome God dothe giue this Faith, not of merite, but of grace. Haue they then all the iustice of Christe, haue they that, which Christe Act. 18. 17.

dyd in his bodye, put vppon them? May they say, as he sayde, Death where is thy sting, Hell where is thy victorie? May they say, death is swallowed vp in victorie? May they say, there is no condemnation to vs whiche are in Christe Iesus? what remayneth then? that they walke according to the Spirite, not according to the flesh: that they glorifie God before men, whiche hath already made them the children of God. Not to do ageyn ỹ which is done alreadie, for that is impossible: not to ioyne a piece to Christes, as thoughe it were not perfect. For he left no piece vnpayed. But to receyue by faith that iustification that God doth giue them, without the workes of the lawe. For workes *sequuntur iustificatum, non præcedunt iustificandum:* they followe a man iustified, and goe not before him that is to be iustified: *Effectus autem non præiudicat causæ* as you knowe: The effect neuer preiudiceth the cause. Thorough al the course of our liues we worke, bicause we are iustified: and we do not worke that we may be iustified. And this is the meaning of the Apostle in this place: not as thoughe workes

were

were to be ioyned with faith, to deserue some thing: For then should wee receyue reward due, and not grace. And thus much touching M. Goughe his argument. Now to your Obiection.

Firste, I maruayle that M. Goughe will allowe this terme, Only: when it is not expressed in Canonicall scripture. Next I am sure that there is nothing equiualent vnto it: for faith without the workes of the lawe and fayth onely, or fayth simplie withoute workes, be not of one like condition.

You nede not maruayle much, if you would rightly consider it: Paules whole disputation standeth vpon two *Subiecta*, & one *Prædicatum*, as the people are two to whō he addresseth his doctrine, and must agrée in one. The *subiecta* are these, workes or the Law, fayth or Christ: The *Prædicatum* is Iustification. If then reasoning *à diuisione*, the one be put away, what remayneth? If I reason thus, Of all liuing creatures there is one that is *risibile*, apte to laugh: it is not *Brutum* any brute beast: Therefore it is *Homo*, man. If I reason thus I say, is not this consequent comprehended in *Consequenti*: Therefore onely

man is *visibilis*. So likewise Paule reasoneth: there is one thing which iustifieth. It is not workes, therfore it is fayth. Doth it not nowe folow that being but one, and that one faith: that we may wel conclude that faith only iustifieth? And so adde we nothing to the scripturs, which you seme to lay to M. Coughes charge, by a taunte, but finde it in ỹ verie letter although not literallie. And in so doing we make no new inuentiõ. So taught before vs Theophilact: whose wordes are these, *vt autem haberi pro comperto queat, posse hunc deum, qui impiè vixerit, non solum à tormentis eximere, sed iustum reddere, illud subdit, credenti autem in eum qui iustificat &c. Num igitur est & hic quippiam allaturus? Fidem duntaxat*: that is, But that it may be certaynely knowen that God can not onely deliuer frõ toziments, but also iustifie him which liued wickedly, he addeth that, but to him that beleeueth in him which iustifieth. &c. Must be therfore also bring some thing? Faith onely. And Origenes vppon this same place whiche M. Coughe alleaged, sayeth thus: *Nunc iam velut conclusionem suarum assertionum ponens, in hoc*

Theoph. in Cap. 4. ad Rom.

Origi. Ro. 3.

loco

loco dicit: Vbi est ergo gloriatio tua? Exclusa est: per quam legem? operum? Non, sed per legem fidei: Arbitramur enim iustificari hominem per fidem sine operibus legis: & dicit sufficere solius fidei iustificationem, ita vt credens quis tantummodo iustificetur, etiamsi nihil ab eo operis fuerit expletum. Nowe, making as it were a conclusion of his assertions sayeth in this place, where is then thy reioyling: it is excluded. By what law? of workes? No, but by the lawe of faith: for we suppose or conclude that mā is iustified by faith without the workes of the Law: and he sayeth, that the iustification of only faith is sufficient, so that a mā beleeuing onely may be iustified although that no work be don of him. I will not alleage here Hierom on ỳ 4. of this Epistle: *Conuertentem impium,* and ageiu, *vt omnes qui ex Gentibus. &c* Hierome. nor Amb. 1. Cor. 15. *hoc constitutum est à Deo. &c.* nor Bernard. *ser.* 22. *super Can. Quamobrem quisquis pro peccatis* Ambrose. Bernard. in all which you find these wordes, *Sola fides ad iustitiam reputatur: per solam fidem iustificat Deus, saluus fit sine opera, sola fide, et soli iustificatus per fidem.* that is, only sayth is accompted vnto righteousnesse;

By only faith God iustifieth, that he may be saued without worke, through onely fayth, and beyng iustified only by fayth. As for the workes which follow, as I sayd before, we condēne them not, we prayse them, as God did in Abraham, Abraham beleeued God, and it was imputed to him for righteousnes, and he was called the friend of God. In that he beleeued God, within in his harte, it consisteth in fayth onely, concerning that he lead his sonne to sacrifise him, in that without feare he armed his right hande, in that he would haue stricken had he not bin withholden, surelie it was a great fayth, & the worke also was great, & God prayseth the worke when he sayd, bycause thou obeyedst my voyce. Wherefore then sayth the Apostle Paule, we conclude that man is iustified by fayth without the workes of the law: and in an other place. It is fayth whiche worketh by charitie? how doth fayth worke by charitie? & how is a man iustified by fayth without the workes of the lawe? This semeth hard that a man shall be iustified by fayth onely, and yet that fayth must worke by charitie. Not

at

at all: for in that, ỳ it is sayd to iustifie, it sheweth what thou hast receyued of God, in that it is sayd to worke by charitie, it sheweth what thou owest to God. For so maske iustification stand, that it may be applyed vnto all men, whether they be called in ỳ morning, or at none, or at night? There is one that beleeueth, he hath receyued the sacrament of faith, and is dead, he hadde no time to worke, what shall wee say? that he is not iustified? we say playne that he was iustified, because he beleeued in him whiche iustifieth the wicked. Therefore this man is iustified, & did not worke. The sentence of the Apostle is fulfilled: I conclude that a man is iustified by fayth without the workes of the law. The theef which was crucified with Christ beleeued in hart to Iustice, and confessed by mouth to saluation. For fayth which worketh by charitie, although it haue not wherein it may worke externally, yet is it kept fervent in the harte. If then fayth in these & such like doth iustifie, why shall it not in others? Because one man lyueth longer than an other after his vocation, shall

therefore the righteousenesse of God be changed? shal therefore man be made fellowe with God in the worke of his saluation, because he hath bestowed a greater benefite of longer lyfe vppon him? Is this the thank that GOD shall haue at oure handes, for giuing vs space to glorifie him, to vse it as a meanes that we oure selues may glorie? For surely if we deserue any thing, we haue wherein to glorie. But when all is done it is but an euil fauored glorie, for it is not with God. But let vs goe farther.

S. Paule excluding workes of the Lawe, meaneth workes that goe before fayth, which do not iustifie. S. Iames in the example of Abraham forbidding that fayth only doth iustifie, speaketh of workes that followe fayth, whiche doe also iustifie, that is, giue encrease of iustice. *Abraham pater noster nónne ex operibus iustificatus est, offerens Isaac super Altare?* Abraham our Father was he not iustified by workes, when he offered his sonne Isaac vppon the Altare?

If workes before fayth do not iustifie, much lesse workes after fayth: before man had

had nede, and after he hath no nede: then is a benefite requisite, when a man is in pouertie: but when he is riche, it is not nedfull. To be shorte bycause I haue handled this before, workes do neuer goe before iustification. For the Scripture is playne. If it be grace, then not of workes, otherwayes were grace nowe no grace. And this is as well for youre workes after as before. As for that that is sayde often tymes, and you alleage it before, *factores legis iustificabuntur*, the doers of the lawe shall be iustified. It is so to be vnderstanded, to wit, that they could not otherwise be doers of the law, vnlesse they be iustified. So that Iustification cōmeth not to the doers, but iustification goeth before the doers of the Law. For what other thing doth this meane, Iustified, but made iust? that is to say, of him which iustifieth ỹ wicked, that he may become iust of wicked. For sanctification goeth not before Iustification, but Iustification before Sanctification. Touching the place of S. James, there is no such matter in it as you make. You maye see by the whole course of the chapter, that he speaketh not how

Rom. 11.

Aug. de spir. & lit. 26. ca. Tom. 3.

how man is iustified before god, but how they ought to shew before men, that they are iuste before God. So that he beateth downe the vayne opinion of them, which thought that yᵗ they beléued, it belonged not to them to do well, and therefore contemned good workes, as who would say they were not bound to glorifie God before men, who had glorified them with him self. And touching the example of Abraham, yᵗ you conferre the scriptures togither, as Genesis with Iames: you shall sée that Abraham was iustified before, and this is but the shew of his obedience vnto God, ỹ all the worlde might know be nothing misdouted the promise of God, although his onely sonne must go to bée offered, and this do your doctors teach, which you heare recite.

Lib. 83. q. 9. 76. To this effect S. Augustine reconcileth these two Apostles. *Non sunt contraria duorum Apostolorum sententiæ Pauli & Iacobi: cum dicit vnus iustificari hominem per fidem sine operibus, & alius dicit, inanem esse fidem sine operibus, quia ille dicit de operibus quæ præcedunt fidem, iste de his, quæ fidem sequuntur.* These sentences of the two Apostles

stles, Paul and Iames, be not contrarie vnto them selues: when the one saith, that a man is iustified by fayth without workes. The other sayth, that fayth is vayne and ydle without workes, for Paule speaketh of workes that goeth before faith, Iames speaketh of those that follow fayth.

I doe not see to what great purpose this place is alleaged, bee it that this reconciliation is good, can you conclude that Augustin teacheth or Iames eyther, that workes iustifie before God: that can you neuer proue. The place you bring, he hath in many places, yet in none of them doth he conclude as you do. But in euery one he teacheth this, ỹ therefore Iames writte this Epistle and likewise, Peter his, to shewe that after fayth receyued, works of righteousnesse ought not to be contemned: & that what soeuer workes they doe, they are of a iustified man, and not to iustifie a man. For when it is sayd that the doers of the law shall bee iustified, what other thing is sayd, than this: Let hee that is righteous, be righteous still. For the doers of ỹ law are iust. And therefore it is as much as yf it should bee sayd.

De fide & ope. cap. 14. De sp. & lit. ad Marcel. cap. 26.

sayd. The doers of ỹ law shall be created, not because they were, but that they may be. You go forward against M. Gough.

Luk. 8. An other place he brought to expresse by scripture this worde, Onely, that fayth onely doth iustifie: alleaging the saying of Christe vnto Iairus Prince of the Synagogue. *Crede tantùm*, Beleeue onely. A place verie fitly applied: as yf Christe there had spoken of the Iustification of Iairus, and not rather of the corporall reuiuing of his daughter.

As for M. Goughes alleaging of the place, I do not thinke, but he sawe what was principally done in that place, and that Christ was reuiuing of his daughter: yet not withstanding he might note vnto you, in what sorte we ought to behaue our selues towardes ỹ receyuing of Christes benefites and graces, that although things seme vnto vs desperate, voyde of all hope and comforte, yet we should not cease, but to beleeue in Christe, that he is able to do whatsoeuer we demaunde in feare and truth. And this hope and fayth is sufficient, and he requireth nothing els at our handes. This I say, why might he

not

not note vnto you touching onely fayth, hauing two suche notable examples before his face as the woman with the flur, Iairus with his dead daughter. And so might he make his argument. As fayth onely is sufficient to the curing of an vncurable sore, and the raising of the dead, so is it sufficient to the remission of sinnes. Neyther is he voyde of authoritie for his interpretation. Theophilacte sayth thus: *Ne timeas, tantum credas: respice ad mulierem hanc, quæ sanguinis profluuio laborauit, illam si imitatus fueris non aberrabis.* Feare not, onely beleeue: Behold this Woman whiche was sicke of the flure, yf thou folowe her, thou shalt not do amisse. Neyther is Iames cleane contradictorie (as you say) to Master Gough in this sense, where he sayeth, *Videtis quoniam ex operibus iustificatur homo, non ex fide tantùm.* You see that of workes man is iustified, and not of fayth onely. Theo. in Luk 8.

There is you knowe *Oppositio in terminis*, opposition in wordes, and *oppositio realis*, opposition in matter. As for the first ye knowe also it is nothing, and so may

thele

these two be, *fides tantum iustificat, fides tãsum non iustificat*, fayth only dothe iustifie: fayth only doth not iustifie. As for ỹ other, there must be *vnuocatio in terminis*, the *Subiectum* and the *Prædicatum* must be taken in one sense in both. Otherwise there is no opposition, For both may be true. As in this, fayth only iustifieth, the word (Iustifieth) is taken in this sence, Iustifieth before God. In the other, Fayth only doth not iustifie: the word (Iustifieth) is taken hauing respect to men. And so they be not opposite. Of the sense of the place I spake before. Likewise of the place of Luke. viij. I haue sayd my mind what M. Gough his meaning was: I was not at his Sermon, & I promisse you I haue not talked with him therin, I skant know the person.

Cap. 14. S. Augustine in his booke *de fide & operibus*, sheweth the beginning and foundation of this muche like heresie to haue bin in the Apostles time, vpon the misconstruing of Paules Epistles, saying: *Quoniam hæc opinio tunc fuerat exorta, aliæ Apostolicæ epistolæ Petri, Iohannis, Iacobi, & Iudæ, cõtra eam maximè dirigunt intentionem, vt vehementer astruant fidem sine operibus nihil prodesse.*

desse. That is: bicause this opinion was then sprōg vp, other Apostolicall epistles of Peter, Iohn, Iames & Iude, do bend their drift and purpose most of all against that opinion, that they may boldely and vehemently affyrme faith without workes to auaile nothing. If it be fayth only, it is fayth without works: If faith only auaileth nothing, faith only can not iustifie.

What opinion that was (M. Fecknam) & how vnlike vnto our assertion I shewed you before out of ỳ same place, and it was this, as you haue it in the beginning of the chapter. *Bene autem viuere & bonis operibus viam dei tenere neglexerint*, and they contemne to liue well, and to kēpe the way of God in good workes. Ye sayth not, *& bonis operibus incrementum iustitiæ addere*, and with good woorkes to giue encrease of iustice. Which pēce you stand for, & which you shal neuer be able to shew out of Augustine, and so we deny it. As for your collection, if faith only auaileth nothing, faith only can not iustifie: we deny ỳ consequēt. For as I said before, ther is not *vniuocatio in terminis*. We say true, that nothing else but faith doth iustifie: and yet say, ỳ faith

how man is iustified before god, but how they ought to shew before men, that they are iuste before God. So that he beateth downe the vayne opinion of them, which thought that yf they beleeued, it belonged not to them to do well, and therefore contemned good workes, as who would say they were not bound to glorifie God before men, who had glorified them with him self. And touching the example of Abraham, yf you conferre the scriptures togither, as Genesis with Iames: you shall see that Abraham was iustified before, and this is but the shew of his obedience vnto God, ỹ all the worlde might know he nothing misdouted the promise of God, although his onely sonne must go to be offered. and this do your doctors teach, which you heare recite.

Lib. 83. q. 9. 76. To this effect S. Augustine reconcileth these two Apostles. *Non sunt contrariæ duorum Apostolorum sententiæ Pauli & Iacobi: cum dicit vnus iustificari hominem per fidem sine operibus, & alius dicit, inanem esse fidem sine operibus, quia ille dicit de operibus quæ præcedunt fidem, iste de his, quæ fidem sequuntur.* These sentences of the two Apostles

stles, Paul and Iames, be not contrarie vnto them selues: when the one saith, that a man is iustified by fayth without workes. The other sayth, that fayth is vayne and ydle without workes, for Paule speaketh of workes that goeth before faith, Iames speaketh of those that follow fayth.

I doe not see to what great purpose this place is alleaged, bee it that this reconciliation is good, can you cõclude that Augustin teacheth or Iames eyther, that workes iustifie before God: that can you neuer proue. The place you bring, he hath in many places, yet in none of them doth he conclude as you do. But in euery one he teacheth this, ỹ therefore Iames writte this Epistle and likewise, Peter his, to shewe that after sayth receyued, works of rightousnesse ought not to be contemned: & that what soeuer workes they doe, they are of a iustified man, and not to iustifie a man. For when it is sayd that the doers of the law shall bee iustified, what other thing is sayd, than this? Let hee that is righteous, be righteous stil. For the doers of ỹ law are iust. And therefore it is as much as yf it should bee sayd.

De fide & ope. cap. 14. De sp. & lit. ad Marcel. cap. 26.

sayd. The doers of ỹ law shall be created, not because they were, but that they may be. You go forward against M. Gough.

Luk. 8. An other place he brought to expresse by scripture this worde, Onely, that fayth onely doth iustifie: alleaging the saying of Christe vnto Iairus Prince of the Synagogue. *Crede tantùm*, Beleeue onely. A place verie fitly applied: as yf Christe there had spoken of the Iustification of Iairus, and not rather of the corporall reuiuing of his daughter.

As for M. Goughes alleaging of the place, I do not thinke, but he sawe what was principally done in that place, and that Christ was reuiuing of his daughter: yet not withstanding he might note vnto you, in what sorte we ought to behaue our selues towardes ỹ receyuing of Christes benefites and graces, that although things seeme vnto vs desperate, voyde of all hope and comforte, yet we should not cease, but to beleeue in Christe, that he is able to do whatsoeuer we demaunde in feare and truth. And this hope and fayth is sufficient, and he requireth nothing els at our handes. This I say, why might he not

not note vnto you touching onely fayth, hauing two suche notable examples before his face as the woman with the flur, Iairus with his dead daughter. And so might he make his argument. As fayth onely is sufficient to the curing of an vncurable sore, and the raising of the dead, so is it sufficient to the remission of sinnes. Neyther is he voyde of authoritie for his interpretation. Theophilacte sayth thus: *Ne timeas, tantùm credè: respice ad mulierem hanc, quæ sanguinis profluuio laborauit, illam si imitatus fueris non aberrabis.* Theo. in Luk 8. Feare not, onely beléue: Behold this Woman whiche was sicke of the flure, yf thou folowe her, thou shalt not do amisse. Neyther is Iames cleane contradictorie (as you say) to Master Gough in this sense, where he sayeth, *Videtis quoniam ex operibus iustificatur homo, non ex fide tantùm.* You see that of workes man is iustified, and not of fayth onely.

There is you knowe *Oppositio in terminis*, opposition in wordes, and *oppositio realis*, opposition in matter. As for the first ye knowe also it is nothing, and so may

thele

these two be, *fides tantum iustificat, fides tãsum non iustificat*, fayth only dothe iustifie: fayth only doth not iustifie. As for ỳ other, there must be *vnuocatio in terminis*, the *Subiectum* and the *Prædicatum* must be taken in one sense in both. Otherwise there is no opposition, For both may be true. As in this, fayth only iustifieth, the word (Iustifieth) is taken in this sence, Iustifieth before God. In the other, Fayth only doth not iustifie: the word (Iustifieth) is taken hauing respect to men. And so they be not opposite. Of the sense of the place I spake before. Likewise of the place of Luke. 6. I haue sayd my mind what M. Gough his meaning was: I was not at his Sermon, & I promisse you I haue not talked with him therin, I skant know the person.

Cap. 14. S. Augustine in his booke *de fide & operibus*, sheweth the beginning and foundation of this muche like heresie to haue bin in the Apostles time, vpon the misconstruing of Paules Epistles, saying: *Quoniam hæc opinio tunc fuerat exorta, aliæ Apostolicæ epistolæ Petri, Iohannis, Iacobi, & Iudæ, cõtra eam maximè dirigunt intentionem, vt vehementer astruant fidem sine operibus nihil prodesse.*

desse. That is: bicause this opinion was then sprõg vp, other Apostolicall epistles of Peter, Iohn, Iames & Iude, do bend their drift and purpose most of all against that opinion, that they may boldely and vehemently affyrme faith without workes to auaile nothing. If it be fayth only, it is fayth without works: If faith only auaileth nothing, faith only can not iustifie.

What opinion that was (M. Fecknam) & how vnlike vnto our assertion I shewed you before out of ỹ same place, and it was this, as you haue it in the beginning of the chapter. *Bene autem viuere & bonis operibus viam dei tenere neglexerint,* **and they contemne to liue well, and to kæpe the way of God in good workes. Ye sayth not,** *& bonis operibus incrementum iustitiæ addere,* and with good woorke, to giue encrease of iustice. **Which pæce you stand for, & which you shal neuer be able to shew out of Augustine, and so we deny it. As for your collection,** if faith only auaileth nothing, faith only can not iustifie: **we deny ỹ consequẽt. For as I said before, ther is not** *vniuocatio in terminis* **We say true, that nothing else but faith doth iustifie: and yet say, ỹ faith**

which is dead & sole is nothing worthe: for it is not that which we say doth iustifie.

Lib. 15. cap. 18 Likewise he saith in his boke *de trinitate* very briefly and pithily: *sine charitate fides quidem potest esse, sed non & prodesse.* Without charitie faith may be, but without charitie, it can nothing auaile.

Iam. 2. 20. 1. Cor. 13. This is very wel said, we graũt al this, he speaketh according to ẏ scriptures, you néed not haue gon so far. S. James, s. Paul, could haue taught you ẏ same. But to your purpose it serueth very little: yea nothing at al. Now touching your tretise of works done in faith, wheras you are misgréeued with M. Gough so far, that you cal it a preposterous way, and a blasphemous doctrin, to say that our workes are as filthie cloutes, vnto which Christ promiseth a rewarde so great as euerlasting life, if you would iustly consider with your self the duetie that god requireth of vs, & the default that is in vs, the integritie, the puritie ẏ we are bound to by his commandement, & the imperfection, ẏ impuritie ẏ is in vs, you coulde not iustly cõdemne him: god cõmaundeth vs to serue him with all our harts, with all our soule, with al our strẽgth: what is he vpon the

earth, that doth employ these wholy, ȳ hath not alwayes ȳ flesh pricking against the spirit: then the worke ȳ is done of such, is it not as a menstruous cloth: could it be acceptable before God, were it not for his mercy: If it please him of the same mercy, to giue me lyfe euerlasting for my halfe dayes, nay for my one houres worke, doth it folow that my worke is worthy of it, when all the workes of the world be not worth lyfe euerlasting, Chrystes death excepted?

Then touching your other cauil of faith only: How only? without baptisme? without repentance? without feare? without hope? without charitie? You may vnderstand of that I haue sayd before, howe all these must folow and an hundreth more, and yet fayth only must iustifie, what soeuer he be that casteth these away in that respect that he is iustified by faith, he deceiueth him selfe and he is not iustified: He is a dead tree, he is a thorne that bryngeth forth grapes, he is a thistle that bryngeth forth figges, and when the Lord commeth, he shall cut downe this tree, and cast it into the fire that shall neuer be put out.

But hée that hath a true fayth, hath a
these frutes, they follow him as his hand-
maydes, he serueth himselfe of them, and
serueth his lége Lorde with them: he is
baptized, he is penitent, he stãdeth in awe,
he hopeth, he loueth, and all for the glorie
of his Maister: and yet not without his
owne profit. He deserueth nothing, yet
shall he haue great reward: he meriteth
not a myte, yet shall he haue thousandes:
So standeth fayth amongest her damsels,
and yet she is singular: She walketh with
great companie, and yet is she alone. And
this to your third question.

4 *That euerie sinne is not mortall.*

MAister Goughe towardes the ende of his sermõ, did verie cõstantly affirme, that euery sinne committed by a Christian man, is deadly and mortall sinne: and that no sinne is veniall, no not an idle thought, as light as men made of it. Much like vnto the old heresie of Iouinian, which to make

all

all sinnes equall, made euery sinne lykewise a deadly sinne. Whome S. Augustine condemned more than a thousande yeares agoe, as appeareth in his 6. Tom. de Hæres. Hær. 82.

Now S. Augustine cõdemned Iouinian, and wherefore, it is manifest there in the place you recite and in his Epistles, for making all sinnes equall in dæd: But not for saying that all sinnes deserue death, and therefore are mortall: That you can not finde in S. Augustine or any other: There is great difference betwixte these two propositions, *Omnia peccata sunt æqualia*, and *Omnia peccata sunt mortalia*: All sinnes are equall, and all sinnes are mortall. For you can not conclude, They are all mortall, therefore they are all equall. Although contrarie after a certayne manner it may be sayde they are all equall, therefore they be mortall. We saye, that whosoeuer is angrie with his brother without a cause, shall be culpable of iudgement: We saye to, whoso sayeth fole to his brother, shal be punished with hell fire: We saye the lyke of murder, we say the like of the sinne of *Sodome*, and

yet say we not that these offẽces be a like: that it is all one to saye, fole, to thy brother and all one to be a *Sodomite*, a manslayer, an adulterer. Although that ỹ maiestie of God be offended in them all, yet in some of them, thou sinnest ageinst nature, thou sinnest ageinst heauen and earth, the sonne it selfe is ashamed to behold thy villanie, and thou ashamed to shewe thy selfe in light: in some, thy sin is so horrible, ỹ if man do winke, yet ỹ earth will cry out for vengeãce. For some, Cities & towns, fieldes, euen paradises, for some, ỹ whole world hath bin destroyed as you reade, wher other god hath more mercifully dealt. And shall we say, that bicause the long patience and mercie of God doth giue vs time to repentance, therfore these sinnes ỹ wee cõmit deserue not punishment? That bycause he some pardoneth them to his, therfore their reward is not death: For so you and yours say *venniale peccatum de sui natura est venia dignum*, veniall sinne of his nature is worthy pardon. A sinne it is, an erring & wandring frõ the will of God, a deturning from his ways (for so doth this worde Chot signifie) and yet forsothe he may

Raym. tract. 4 De pœnit.

.....ȳ stand in his owne iustice with God: and say vnto him, I am worthy to be pardoned? A wound which nedeth not to bee wrapped, a sore ful of corruption ȳ nedeth no emplaster: a swelling that nedeth not to be mollified with oyle, a sick mā which nedeth no Phisitiō? wel we shal haue further occasiō to speak of these more at large hereafter. We wil now come to your reasons you bring to confirme your doctrine.

Let vs conferre herewithall two sayings of the Scripture: the one of S. Iohn which sayeth as well of himselfe and of euery iust man, as of the sinner. *Si dixerimus. &c.* If we say that we haue no sin, we deceyue our selues, and the truthe is not in vs: meaning that the iustest man a lyue is not without sinne. Nowe, if this sinne be as M. Goughe teacheth, deadly, mortal and damnable sin, whiche separateth the soule of man from God, and condemneth it to hell fire, let vs see how a mā may be called iust, which dayly committeth such damnable sinne. 1. Iohn. 1.

This place maketh more ageinst you, than with you, you wil not say I thinke ȳ S. Iohn was one of ȳ most grieuous sinners, ȳ he was an adulterer, a dronkerd. &c.

And yet was he a sinner as the iustest ma is, yet sinned he. vij. tymes, and lacked the glorie of God. And of the same sinnes, he spake in that sentence, of the same spake he in the sentence before, saying: And the bloud of Christ his sonne clenseth vs from all our sinnes. And in the sentence after: If we acknowledge our sinnes, he is faithfull and iust to forgiue vs our sinnes, and to clense vs from all vnrighteousnesse. He cõprehendeth him self in the number and sayeth, clense vs from all, forgiue vs all our sinnes. Then belike the sinnes of S. Iohn had nede of it: If they had nede, why was it? Was it not, bicause that *stipendium peccati mors est*? the wages of sinne is death? But peraduẽture he did not acknowledge these for any sinnes. Then by your conclusion he had no sinne. Take hede of that, if you say so, he wil answer you straight, you are a lier. But you can not se, how a man may be called iust, which daily cõmitteth such deadly sinne. You cã not se how Dauid sayth. *Beati quorũ remissæ sunt iniquitates & quorum tecta sunt peccata*, blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiuen, and whose sinnes are couered? And yet, *ne intres*

in

...n iudicium cum ſeruo tuo, Domine, quia non iuſtificabitur, in conſpectu tuo omnis viuens, enter not into iudgemēt with thy ſeruant, O Lord, for in thy ſight ſhall none lyuing be iuſtified. Dauid telleth you in an other place, the iuſt man falleth, but he riſeth vp again. He repenteth him ſelf, and flyeth to the mercy of God, and he doth forgiue him. After this you come againe to the place of Luke cōcerning Zacharie and Elizabeth: touching which place bicauſe I haue anſwered it before, I wil ſay nothing: but beſides I there alleaged both out of *Gloſſa ordinaria* Theophilact and Iuſtin⁹ Martyr, I will now alſo refer you to Ierom *aduerſus Pelag. ad Chte.* where you ſhal ſée, whether any ſuch thing be to be concluded or no, & take hēde you be not a Pelagian in that poinct. As for the contradiction you there ſpeake of, which foloweth of theſe two places conferred togither, if M. Goughs expoſition do ſtand: there is none, more thā foloweth of your words. For as you ſay here after, peraduenture againſt your will, bicauſe Auguſtin enforceth you thither, you muſt ſay for the leaſt ſin you can deuiſe, forgiue vs our treſpaſſes: if you did treſpaſſe him,

him, you were not without blame. So you make a contradiction against your self, for that you say, a iust mā is without blame, & yet he must say forgiue me. The truthe is as I said (M. Fecknam) there is no contradiction, to say a mā sinneth damnably, and therfore in consideration of his own doing worthy to be condemned: yet being pardoned by the frē mercy of Christ, he is without blame. As the Apostle sayeth, who can lay any thing to our charge? not respecting that, that we are, but that, that we receiue. And so I trust I haue sufficiētly answeared you for that place.

Rom. 8. 33.

Iac. 1.

To this may bee added the place of S. Iames: where he describeth concupiscēce to make a sin in vs beside mortall sin, saying, *Concupiscentia cùm conceperit, &c:* cōcupiscēce when it hath conceiued, bringeth forth sinne, but sinne whē it is finished: begetteth death. Signifying hereby that sinne is then mortall & deadly, when a man cōmitteth it with a ful consent & other circūstāces. For if a light passion or a carnall thought stealeth vpon a man by sodein delectation without consent, the same is not a sinne, which engendereth death, but a veniall sinne.

S. James

S. James his purpose is not as you say, to shew how cõcupiscence maketh a sinne besides mortal sinne, neither cã you proue, by this place, that which you graunt that concupiscence is a sin (although it be true.) S. James goeth not about here to shewe, when sinne beginneth to be a sinne, to be taken and estemed so before God: But to shew, when it commeth forth, and whence it proceadeth, that he might against the false surmises of others, shewe, that their sinne and tempting, procedeth not from God. His order is this, The consummation of sinne procureth Death euerlasting: sinne procedeth from vnordinate desires, vnordinate desires from concupiscence. Therefore in that, that men are condemned for their sinnes, they receiue but the frute which they brought forth thẽ selues: and therefore can they not cast any fault on God. Can you now thẽ proue by this place, that either concupiscence is a sinne which I deny not) eyther that it is not a mortall sinne? But of thys place I gather, that my condemnation is of my self: I canne not gather that Concupiscence is a Sinne, but onely by a consequent,

bicause

because it bringeth forth sinne. For such as the fruyte is, such is the tree, and so may I conclude agayne. The fruyte is damnable, therefore the tree. But here I
Exod. 20. do gather it. *Nõ cõcupisces.* Thou shalt not couet, and so bicause it is a sinne, I con-
Eze. 18. 20. clude it is mortall, *Anima quæ peccauerit ipsa morietur.* The soule that shall offend or erre, the same shall dye. For the word the Prophet there vseth hachoteth signifieth but a missing and an erring from that he is directed vnto, whiche is. Thou shalt loue the Lorde thy GOD with all thy harte, with all thy Soule,
Iudi. 20. 16 &c. so read we in the scriptures, all these could sling stones at an haires breadth,
Rom. 7. ve lo iachati, and not fayle. And Paule also speaking of him selfe, and not sinning any other mortall sinne, sayth. *Quis me liberabit de corpore mortis huius*, who shall deliuer me from the body of this death?
Sum. Raymundi tract 4. de pœnitentia. Whether you make your venial sinne a fayling or no, I referre it to your conscience. Some of you writers say thus. *Peccatum veniale est quod cum voluntatis deliberatione inordinata homo committit*, veniall sinne is that, which a man commit-

teth

ꝛth by an vnoꝛdinate deliberation of his will: what they are he reketh vp there, as when a man eateth and dꝛinketh moꝛe than he nédeth yf it bée by chaunce, when he ſpeaketh moꝛe than he ought, oꝛ boldeth his peace moꝛe than is conuenient: when he bereth the poꝛe deſiring almes out of time. The vſe of a mans owne wife otherwiſe than the inſtitution of God is: dꝛunkennelle, yf it bée not to often. Foꝛ of nature it is no deadly ſinne, & ſuch like. And as you put in a lighte paſsion or a carnall thought, ſtealing vppon a man by ſodayne delectation. Theſe and ſuches others are your veniall ſinnes, ſuch ſins as are woꝛthy pardon of their owne nature. Is dꝛunkennelle but once done woꝛthy of pardon by nature? Is making whoꝛedome of mariage a ſinne woꝛthy pardon euen of nature? Is vexing the afflicted, a ſinne to bée pardoned euen of nature? is the enimitie of God, a ſinne woꝛthie pardon euen of nature? Paule ſayth that a dꝛunkerd, an adulterer ſhall not inherite the kingdome of Heauen. What Chriſte aunſwereth them that are ſuche to the poꝛe. *Ite maledicti in ignem æternum*, goe ye curſed into euer- § Integra.

euerlasting fyre, will tell you: That, that is of the flesh displeaseth God, the scripture telleth you also: what the displeasure of God is, the whole scriptures teach you. Do not you fayle thinke you in these and suche like, from the will of your heauenly father? S. Augustine sayth that these things pertayne *ad corruptionem Templi Dei*, to the corruption of the temple of God: not onely the more greeuous sinnes, but the least, *Si qua vobis immoderatio de vsu istorum concessarum rerum vitæ humanæ infirmitate irrepserit*, yf any immoderatenes by the vse of thinges permitted vnto you, do creepe into you by the frayltie of mans lyfe. *Quoniam pertinet ad corruptionem Templi Dei*, Because it pertayneth to the corruption of the Temple of God, *tenete*, hold you, &c. And make you a small thing of the marring of the temple of God? *Qui templum Dei corrumperit, corrumpet illum Deus. &c.* sayth he. He that marreth the temple of God, God will marre him. What meaneth that, *corrumpet illum Deus*, God will marre him? I thinke it be not very farre from death. Well let vs see what you bring

Ser. 34. de voca. Pau. Ap.

1. Cor. 3. 17

bring out of Augustine.

To this place alludeth S. Augustine, where he speaketh of concupiscence that remayneth in those whiche bee regenerate, saying: *Ab illo rebellante, & si non lataliter, sed venialiter tamen vincimur.* That is, of that sinne concupiscence rebelling against vs, we be ouercomed, although not deadly, yet venially. It followeth, *& in his contra-himus, vnde quotidie dicamus, dimitte nobis debita nostra.* And in these (veniall sinnes) we gather, by meanes whereof we may say daily. Forgeue vs Lord our trespasses. To. 7. lib. 2. contr. Iulianum. pag. 985. col. 1.

S. Augustine in deede speaketh of such remnaunts of originall sinne as remayne in the elect after they bee regenerate, whereof S. Paule spake. *Caro concupiscit aduersus spiritum.* The flesh coueteth agaynst the spirite: and sayth, that wee are ouercome of this remnaunt not deadly, but venially. The reason is in S. Paule. Because there is no condemnation to them whiche are in Christ Iesus, and that that relique is not able to bringe forth any suche Sinne in the electe, whereby he may bee condemned,

yet

yet notwithstanding, least we should think ourselues not to be indetted or endaungered by this meanes vnto God, thus much we get, sayth he, that we must nedes say euery day, forgiue vs our trespasses. And he sheweth not in this place, what it is in it selfe, but what it is in the elect. S. Augustine in an other place calleth these *leuia peccata*, light sinnes, not simplie but *comparatè*, by comparison. Of the sinnes of this lyfe, sayth he, *Quædam grauia & mortifera sunt, quæ nisi per vehementissimam molestiam humiliationis cordis, & contritionis spiritus, & tribulationis pœnitentiæ non relaxantur. Hæc dimittuntur per claues Ecclesiæ.* Some are greiuous and deadly which are not released but by most vehement sorowe of humilitie of the harte, and contrition of the spirit, and tribulation of repentãce. These are remitted by the keyes of the Church. *Sunt autem leuia peccata & minuta, quæ deuitari omnino non possunt, quæ quidem videtur minora, sed multitudine præmunt:* There are light sinnes and small, whiche can be eschewed by no meanes, whiche trulie séeme to be lesse, but they ouercharge by reason of the multitude.

And

And marke this by the way, a most playne contradiction to your first question: *Quæ deuitari non possunt*, which cā not be eschewed: and *sine quibus non potest ista vita duci*, without the whiche this lyfe can not be lead, and yet you say, the cōmaundements may be fulfilled. *Posse implere Legem*, to be able to fulfill the Lawe: is, *Posse non concupiscere*, to be able not to couet or lust. *Nō potes non concupiscere*, thou art not able not to couet or lust, *Ergo, non potes Legem implere*, therefore thou arte not able to fulfill the Lawe. And so might you haue had regard to Christes wordes, *quæ apud homines impossibilia sunt, apud Deum possibilia sunt*, those things whiche are impossible with men, with GOD be possible. And a little after: *Sic ergo quamuis minuta sunt ista peccata, tamen quia multa sunt, vt congregata aceruum faciant, quo te premant, bonus est Deus qui etiam ipsa dimittit, sine quibus non potest ista vita duci*: So then although these be little sinnes, yet bycause they be many, that thei being gathered togither make a heape to ouerpresse thée, God is good who forgiueth thē also, without which this lyfe can not be passed. You

Aug. ser. 39. hoc dicit Moses.

Luk. 18. 27.

see by this place, that remission is giuē to them both, and debtes they are both. But bicause he is more readie to forgiue the one than the other, he calleth them in this place, *grauia & leuia*, grieuous or weighty, and lighte: in other places *venalia & letalia*, venial and deadly. I wis you know that these wordes be of comparison, and not *de simplici existentia*, as the Philosophers call them, that is, to declare what those smaler faults be of their own simple existence, or proper nature. I can not tell how little you make of remissiō of sinnes. But by his similitude he bringeth, they would kill you, if remission came not the sooner. And in the ende, (as I alleaged before) of his sermon, he concludeth that bycause they destroy the temple of God, they should take hēd and be readie to cry and call, Forgiue vs our trespasses.

Aug. To. 3. de sp. & lit. Cap. 28.

Ageyne, in his Booke *de Spiritu & litera*, he writeth thus of veniall sinnes: *Sicut non impediunt à vita æterna iustum. &c.* Lyke as some veniall sinnes doe not let a iust man from lyfe euerlasting, without the which this life is not led: So some good workes, do nothing profite a wicked man vnto

vnto life euerlasting without the which the lyfe of euery naughtie mā is hardly found.

You may sée by this place and by the cōparison he maketh, that bothe this place & the other you alleaged before, are so to bée expounded and taken as I haue sayde. For surely no sinne is able to cast the childe of God, whom he hath elected & chosen, out of the fauour of God, out of the kingdome of heauen, which is his inheritance gotten & giuen him by Christe. For the counsels of God are without repentance. So likewise it shall anayle the wicked nothing at all, ỹ he hath some good workes. For he is the child of wrath, the sonne of perdition. As for the fault of youre reasoning, I let it passe: you may thinke with your self how well you deale making such Arguments: these sins are not deadly to the elect & iust: Therfore they are not deadly: *à secūdo ad tertiū negatiuè: Socrates nō est Philosop. academicꝰ, ergo, nō est Philosophus:* Socrates is no Academical Philosopher, therfore he is no philosopher, or M. Fekna was not Abbot of *Osne*, therfore he was no Abbot, for you haue brought neuer a place directly proouing what they are in thēselues.

What you could bring oute of Luther, I know not, when I see it, I will answer it if I cã. *Non iuraui in verba Lutheri*, I haue not sworne to credit euery word ẏ Luther writeth. And sure it is, some thinges he writte extãt in print, before he was well persuaded in many points of soũd doctrine. Now, touching ẏ austeritie of M. Gough, GOD make vs all ageinst vice austere, and not to flatter our selues in our concupiscences: we can not hate sinne to much, nor cõdemne sinne to grieuously. I would I might, I, by the worde of God persuade my selfe that sin were no sinne, mẽ might liue more at libertie. But yet I think my selfe blissed that he hath called me to the libertie of his Gospell, which is free remission of my sinnes & sinful lyfe in the bloud of Christ Iesus, and a calling to walke after the spirite and not after the fleshe. It is time and highe time for vs (M. Fecknam) to beate downe sin, and not to seeke meanes howe we may cloke sinne. Let it appeare in his owne nature, that we may be ashamed of him: put not a Lyons skin vppon an Asse. Call white, white: and blacke, blacke: good, good: and bad, bad.

What the libertie of the Gospel is, & wherein it consisteth.

So

So shall we take hæde, that we fall not to often: and if it can not otherwise be, but we must fall seuen times, yet that we may learne to feare thereby, and not to make a sleabyting of it. If we do so, we shall bee more like to Abell than Cayne: to Isaac, than Ismaell: to Jacob, than Esau: to John, than to the Pharisies: to Simon Peter than to Simon Magus: to John than Judas: in no miserable state, in no euill condition, in state of saluation not perdition, thrist of his mercie releasing our infirmities. If the iuste man did fall only, if there were no more but so, that he sinned & sinned deadly: then were he no iuste man, then were he in as euill case as *Paynims* and heathen people. But in that he falleth and ryseth vp ageyne, as Dauid teacheth vs, he is better than *Paynims*, better than the Heathen: as good as Habel, as Isaac as Jacob, as John, as Simon Peter, and John ageyn: he is, I say, notwithstanding al these falles, the felow of Angelles, the child of God, & inheritour of the kingdome of heauen. Why? Because he hath spoken by the mouth of hys Prophete: Ippol, Io iuiall. He shall fall Pf. 37. 24. Pfal. 37. 24.

but he shal not be cast away: and as ỹ wise mã sayth, Scheba ippol tzaddik vakam *septies cadet iustus sed surget*: the iust man shal fall. vij. times, but he shall rise. As for this word Naphal, to fall, it carryeth with it a more weightier signification than you alledge. All these things being considered, it is no euill way to preach repentance, and yet say that all sinne of it selfe is damnable: to exhort to good workes, and yet to teach a man not to presume of his owne works as to giue part of his saluation, seing that the whole is wrought by Christ his death, and applied to vs by only faith: to exhort all men to pray for eche other, & yet not to spoyle Christ of the office of his mediatorship, which is taken away by the prayer to Saintes: to exhort men to kepe Gods commaundements, and yet to teach ỹ they be impossible: that seing our owne weaknesse through our owne sinne, we may flie to his mercy, and say: *Da quod iubes, & iube quod vis*, giue what thou commaundest, and commaund what thou wilt. So sound Doctrine as this is, God giue grace to all his ministers to preach, & you to embrace: that they with their preching,

and

and you & I with our folowing may glorifie our father which is in heauen.

Thus haue I in few wordes answered your caulling arguments and counterfet stuffe as time did serue me: if not so amply as I might, yet sufficient for those you brought, framing my answere shortly to your argumēt. And as you vniustly lay to M. Coughs charge contradiction to ỹ holy scriptures, to the fathers, and to haue nothing to stād vpon but old heresies reuiued, as of the *Manicheis, Eunomius, Vigilantius,* & *Iouinian*: I haue and do lay to your charge iustly, contradiction to the scriptures, false alleaging of doctors to no purpose, such slēder, such childishe, so against all arte & reason in forming of your talke, as any Boy might haue bin ashamed to haue vsed the like. I haue, and do, I say, lay iustly to your charge your false burdning him with those forsaid heresies, as vnfit as vnaptly layd against him, as any thing could be. I can not see why in these cases you myght not as well haue blamed him to be an *Arrian*, a *Sabellian*, and what you will: as a *Manichean*, an *Eunomian*, a *Vigilantian*, a *Iouinian*.

Now when you haue done all this, as though you had atchieued a notable feate, you require of their worships a thing reasonable (as you wold make it) ý you might not be enforced to come to sermõs: a thing as you say, against all former example, a thing as true as the residue. Did you neuer read Augustine to Vincentius, against the Donatists concerning this matter? If you did not, I pardon your ignorance: If you did, I wil not spare but tel you of your vntruth. Do you not read in his Epistles, *cum hæreticis esse vi agẽdum*, that heretikes must be dealt with by force? Do you not remember that he sayth, it did good to the Churches in his time, That the Donatists were constrained by authoritie to the embracing of christian religion, and there reherseth diuers of their gratulations Do you not remember that he sayth, not to do it is *malum pro malo reddere*, to requite euil for euill? Do you not remember, that he sayeth, *An melius est cum seueritate diligere quam cum lenitate decipere?* Better it is to loue with seueritie, than to deceiue with lenitie? And that it pertaineth to princes? Do you not remẽber how he answereth

Epist. 48.

Epist. 50.

swereth that obiection, bicause there was none in the Apostles time? Do you not remember the example of Nebuchadnezer, which he sayeth signified the state of the Church in the Apostles tyme, & this now? When he constrained to Idolatrie, howe the Apostles were persecuted? When being turned to God, decreed in his kingdom that whosoeuer blasphemed ỳ God of Sydrach, Misach and Abednego should be worthely punished, what prynces ought nowe to do? For then saith he, that scripture was verified, *Quare fremuerunt gentes. &c.* why did the Gentyles tumultuously rage. &c. But now is fulfilled that, *& principes erũt nutrices tuæ*, and Princes shall be thy nurses. Do you not remember how he sayeth, *capitale iudicium*, punishmẽt of death was appoynted by the law of the Emperors against ỳ sacrifices of the Vaganes? Do you not remember when he sayth of that, *quis nostrum quis vestrum non laudat?* Which of vs, which of you doth not praise it? Do not you remẽber how he sayeth, that Constantine did decree *vt conuictorum res fisco vendicarentur?* that the goods of the conuicted should be chalenged to the common

treasure? Do yée not remember, that he was once in that errour, that they should not bée constrayned vntill he was conuicted by examples of the profite it did? Do you not read in the same, that in matters of religion: *Mansuetudo quæ perdit hominem crudelitas est, seueritas quæ castigat improbum charitas est?* gentlenesse which destroyeth a mã is crueltie, seueritie, which chastiseth a wicked mã is charitie? do you not remember the similitudes he vseth? Do you not remember that he sayth, the Church of Christ doth persecute, shewing it in the example of Sara? do you not remember, *pœnam decem librarum auri ab Imperatoribus constitutam*, that by Emperours was appointed or decreed a punishment or penaltie of ten pounds in golde, agaynst the Donatistes? But yf it bee a thing so straunge, agaynst all exãple: why did you so then vse it in Quœnes Maries time, and so farre, that you contented not your selues to cast them in prison, to hale them to Stakes, but to burne them also? yf it had bin no more but your owne example, you might haue bin ashamed, to

Epi. 68. ad Ianuar.

gyue

gine forth this reason. You in your doings coulde bee called *defensores pacis, prouisores Ecclesiæ*, defenders of peace, and gardians of the Churche. The Quenes grace that now is and her Lieuetenaunts are cruell vexers and oppressours. But you shewe your selfe as you are, a righte Donatist both in profession nowe, and in doynges then. As they, when they accused Cæcilian, the Bishop of Carthage to Constantine, and required to haue him punished, then were they *defensores pacis & prouisores Ecclesiæ* defenders of peace and gardianes of the Churche: but when they were serued with theyr owne sause, then they coulde crye out and saye: *Non esse vi agendum*, that there ought to bee no dealing by constrainte. Suche were your doynges in Queene Maries time, this is your demaund and talke nowe. What is this other, than as Tychonius one of theyrs, and your Walker, sayde of you bothe: *Quod volumus, hoc sanctum est.* That is holy that wee will haue. As for our owne men, you name Luther, Bucer, Bullinger, &c. (not citing or coting any theyr

wordes

wordes or one place of their writings,) you might haue thus thought. That they were of a more gentle spirite than you were, and yet would they not haue an obstinate hereti que, mainteyned neyther. Their moderation is good as they learned of Augustine and others, in case they? gentlenesse might bee vsed. But seeing you will not embrace ý, yf you had the smarte you coulde, not complaine of contrarietie to our owne men, neyther of iniurie. As for example wee haue of you. Wee deale otherwise with you, than you dealt with vs. Wee follow that good rule that Augustine giueth, you did it not. *Si terrerentur, & non docerentur, improba quasi dominatio videretur*, yf they should be feared and not taught, it might seeme as a wicked gouernance. You haue bin taught, & are taught, No more with ours but from prison to fire. Therefore as wee do that, so must wee do that followeth. *Sed rursus si docerentur & non terrerentur, vetustate consuetudinis obdurarentur*. But againe yf they should be taught and not feared, they would be hardened with oldnesse of custome. So that what is done is but well done: and not a-

gaynst

gaynst example, as you say: yf worse were shewed, we haue example to, both of Augustine and your owne doings. But this do not I wish for, neyther woulde haue it shewed, God knoweth what I speake, yet so much must I say, because you prouoke it, seming vnto me rather to scoffe at these worshipfull men, than otherwise hauing iust occasion to complayne. God graue you grace to enter into your selfe, that ye may remember how you goe a stray, not walking in such wayes as he hath appointed for you, that at the last you may take vnto him, you may repayre homeward, after this your peregrination, and he receyue you as a most ioyfull Father.

Amen.

VINCIT
BKE